

Katie Essing, 11 S. Tenth Street, commented that she was with the Downtown CID and noted a quality of life issue that came with a vibrant and full downtown was lots of trash . She thanked the Solid Waste Division for helping them work on this issue over many months, and pointed out the CID Board supported the Master Plan, of which the purchase of this property was a part. She explained the CID Board would like the City to save the historic building so it would maintain the streetscape along Walnut since only the parking lot in the back was needed. She stated she believed that would lower the rate impact to the users in the CID.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Essing if the Downtown CID property owners were comfortable paying higher utility rates to offset the cost of this. Ms. Essing replied it had not been an easy decision, but due to the complaints and volume of trash in the area, it seemed to be critical as mentioned by previous speakers.

Mr. Ruffin asked if the building on Walnut Street was currently occupied. Ms. Essing replied she did not believe it was currently occupied.

Ms. Peters commented that part of it was as she had been there yesterday. She explained she thought it had been a 15-foot wide building, but it appeared to be 40 feet wide. The building had two apartments upstairs and a place for business on the first floor. Ms. Peters wondered what they would do with regard to parking for that building if they used the parking lot for trash and recycling. Ms. Essing replied a consideration was parking, but it had been privately held . She understood the owner would give up that parking.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, commented that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) had met the night after this item had appeared on the meeting agenda as an introduction and first reading item. As a result, they had been unaware of it when they had formulated their agenda for their April meeting, and had not been able to discuss it. She expressed her unease as a member of the public with regard to the perils of this purchase. There were two distinct buildings with two distinct addresses. The first floor area, which currently had an organizing office in it, could be used for residential or commercial purposes. Further upstairs were two apartments that could be affordable housing for young people and people of modest means that might work downtown. It was not the luxury housing that tended to be the only option available to students. She commented that in looking at the picture displayed she saw a lot of cars behind the buildings and a lot of space for putting a dumpster on private property when those same private property owners were earning revenue from leasing their buildings to restaurants and other businesses that generated trash. She stated she recalled a discussion that required a property owner to contribute \$50,000 to a sewer bypass downtown because the existing sewer line, which also served the North Central neighborhood by Hubbell Drive and St. Joseph Street, had continually been blocked with grease. She noted they kept spending money or asking others seemingly unrelated to the problem to solve a problem that was the result of a lack of enforcement. Until they solved the grease problem, they were just providing a bigger and more expensive container in which to dump. She asked the Council to think carefully about taking what seemed to be the more difficult, but perhaps, much less expensive route of enforcement first. The two buildings were old and in need of cosmetic help, but they were also representative of a time when business storefronts looked a certain way. She pointed out Ninth Street, around the corner, was a historic district and all of the structures there were contributing

structures to the look and feel of downtown as it existed in the 1920s and 1930s. It represented a cultural heritage of Columbia. When turning the corner from Ninth Street, they continued to see that roofline and those materials indicative of that time. She again asked the Council to think carefully before spending money on something that might be improved by enforcement.

...

Mayor Treece asked if staff had looked at the north facing property in terms of its condition. He wondered what kind of liability they might inherit and if the building would even be in compliance with the UDC if they utilized the parking for trash and recycling containers. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought they could replat it so the south side met all of the requirements of the UDC and they could sell the property on the north. Mayor Treece understood the owner had contacted the City with regard to purchasing only south portion of the property and asked for clarification. Mr. Sorrell replied it had been discussed, and the appraised value was about \$350,000, but the owner had wanted a considerably higher amount. As a result, staff asked for the purchase price for the entire site. Ms. Peters suggested tabling B72-18, which was the sale of the property, to allow time for the HPC to look this property and for staff to address the other issues, such as whether this would meet the UDC. Mayor Treece stated he would be in favor of tabling this. He understood one potential solution was to acquire the lot with the intent of subdividing it and taking only the square footage needed. This would allow time to determine if they needed to leave access to that rear parking lot through a passageway and how all of that would look. In addition, they could place restrictive covenants on the title if merited. He also felt they would want to put it back on the market the day it closed as it should not be a part of the City's portfolio. He commented that he still was not sure it was the responsibility of government to provide a site for trash receptacles, but noted he could be persuaded. Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a deadline on the offer for the property. Mr. Sorrell replied he was not aware of a deadline on the offer, but he did not know what the property owner would do if this was tabled as he had the option of going elsewhere. Ms. Peters made a motion to table B72-18 to the May 21, 2018 Council Meeting to allow time for the Historic Preservation Commission to look at this property and to allow staff time to address the outstanding issues mentioned tonight. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

...

The motion made by Ms. Peters and seconded by Mr. Thomas to table B72-18 to the May 21, 2018 Council Meeting to allow time for the Historic Preservation Commission to look at this property and to allow staff time to address the outstanding issues mentioned tonight was approved unanimously by voice vote.