

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
AUGUST 6, 2020

Case 127-2020

MS. LOE: This brings us to our public hearing section for the evening. Our first case is 127-2020, a request by A Civil Group on behalf of West Rock II, LLC for approval of a rezoning and development plan to be known as the Godfrey PD Plan. The applicant is proposing four four-unit apartment buildings, 16 units total, with vehicular access on to Green Meadows Road. The 1.45-acre property is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Green Meadows Drive and Green Meadows Circle. This item was tabled at the July 9th, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. May we have a staff report please.

MR. PALMER: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. So again, on the public notice for this case, we sent the advance public info postcards. Thirteen property owners were -- and neighborhood associations were contacted. It was advertised on 6/23 in the Tribune. Property owners were sent previous to the July 20th meet-- or was it the -- 9th, yeah, July 9th meeting and then the property owner letters were again to notify those same 13 property owners of this date public hearing, so the date of the public hearing. Okay. So, this site is the undeveloped piece you see there next to Rock Bridge Christian Church. It's on Green Meadows and Green Meadows Circle. They're proposing to rezone from R-1 to PD. Currently the plan depicts four multi-family buildings with 16 total units each with two bedrooms. Each unit also has an access to a one-car garage which is shown with the dashed lines like these here and are typical to each buildings. So, the parking spaces are a bit confusing. So, each unit has a one-car garage which counts as a space; there's 16 there, plus 18 additional spaces on the surface parking. So that's 34 total with two being accessible. There are also 15 additional tandem spaces, but they are not counted. Tandem being the spaces in the driveways in front of the garages. But they are not counted towards the required park in R-MF developments. So, a little background. We've had a handful of concept meetings on this property. We've seen a handful of different design options. One of the more recent ones prior to this proposal anyway came in November of 2019. Discussed 14 single-family attached units as depicted on the plan there. At that time Staff determined that the planned district wasn't appropriate zoning because of its unique location and visual prominence. The property has limited access. The shape of the lot is constricting on development and also the proximity to residential neighborhoods and the heavily trafficked intersections and roadways, they all provide a number of obstacles to traditional development. And so, the planned district would provide for the option to do some kind of creative alternative design here, and I think that this plan is kind of what that would look like. Project density was discussed at that meeting. Staff believed at the time that roughly 12 units should be the cap. That would leave them with roughly

eight to nine units per acre which is slightly higher than a standard single family and slightly slower than standard multi-family. So, it would be a nice transitional piece of property between the two varying land uses. Property. The property is transitional. It actually provides a demarcation between multi-family which is a little further to the east along Green Meadows and single family which is to the north and to the west. We believe the moderate density is appropriate as long as the contextual land uses are respected, and the design of the property is in keeping with those uses. Again, so the development plan depicts the setbacks which are hard to see here but generally they are 25 feet along the Green Meadows Circle side, 15 feet on the Green Meadows Road side and then there's some broader setback over here, I believe it's 15 feet. Sorry, 20 feet on the western property. The setbacks are not consistent with the proposed development, mainly because they're accessing the property from Green Meadows Road which previously the property being R-1 is not permitted because Green Meadows Road is a collector. And so those setbacks were depicted on the plat when Rock Bridge Christian Church divided this property off. And since they're accessing it off of Green Meadows now, they're effectively backwards and they are based also on R-1 zoning. And the 15-foot setback on Green Meadows Road is problematic in that essentially it would allow a building roughly 18 feet off of Green Meadows Road which is out of character with the context and it's also, it's out of character with the multi-family properties nearby where generally they're screened via berms or landscaping and they're set back deeper to basically just visually screen them, and in terms of safety, buffer them from the roadway there. Setbacks are modifiable via planned districts. They're considered part of the PD plan, so they're depicted on the plan and so you would just consider that as an aspect of the plan. And if you approve the plan, you're effectively approving the setbacks as well. Again, access is proposed from Green Meadows Road. I've kind of hit on this already, but it is permitted because it's multi-family and staff supports the arrangement due to limiting of the traffic impacts on Green Meadows Circle and the surrounding single family. The neighbors previously have specifically asked that we limit vehicular access on Green Meadows Circle because it is the more residential street of the two obviously. There is a design exception that has to be considered along with the PD plan. Section 29-4.7(f) states that you must have a working door facing the street from which the property's addressed. The eastern building depicted here on kind of the point of the triangle shape of the lot is facing internal parking. Approval of the design exception would diminish the aesthetic quality and sense of arrival. It's counter to the goals and objectives of the Comp Plan. So, staff views the requested exception as evidence that the proposed development actually exceeds the capacity of the property. If they are accessing it centrally and facing a building inward, perhaps that building should be relocated to where it faces the street. So, staff does agree that PD zoning is appropriate. It permits a creative solution for a difficult site. Proposed development is maximizing density without design innovation or open space or amenities which are all core purposes of the use of a planned district. Setbacks staff believes should be reestablished to fit the building arrangement towards Green Meadows Road which pulls the buildings back off of the busier street. And staff also believes that 2019 concept plan is contextually more appropriate and better suits the goals and objectives of the Comp Plan. So, our

recommendation would be for denial of the requested rezoning and Godfrey PD Plan as well as the requested design exception. And I would be happy to answer any questions.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Before we move on to commissioners' questions, I'd like to ask any commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to this meeting related to this case to please disclose that now so all commissioners have the benefit of the same information to consider on behalf of the case in front of us. Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Just real quickly. Good friend of mine, Senator Graham's widow lives across Green Meadows Road. I cannot repeat here what she said but her view was quite negative and, but that was related to this when she found out what was going on there.

MS. LOE: Anybody else? Ms. Burns.

MS. BURNS: I just wanted to clarify, Mr. Palmer. So, I'm understanding that there are 16 units, 32 bedrooms, and currently planned a total of 34 parking options between the garage and the 18 other spaces?

MR. PALMER: And bike spaces as well.

MS. BURNS: And I'm sorry, what were the additional?

MR. PALMER: Bike spaces.

MS. BURNS: Bike spaces?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. They're required, I'm going to get this wrong, but they're required a certain number of spaces and then we allow a reduction in those spaces based on the required bike space. So, they have four bike spaces that are required, 36 total parking spaces, so they have 32 surface area.

MS. BURNS: Okay. But you couldn't park a car in the bike space?

MR. PALMER: No.

MS. BURNS: I was thinking about visitors. It doesn't leave a whole lot of room for visitors. All right. Thank you.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. And to clarify a little further too, they -- we put it in a staff report to show that there's actually more parking in the driveways but because it's multi-family and because you don't typically see a driveway into a garage in a multi-family situation, there's actually 15, technically 15 more parking spaces.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MR. PALMER: But they just cannot legally be counted on there.

MS. BURNS: That was -- thank you. You've answered my question. Thank you.

MR. PALMER: Uh-huh. And real quick, I forgot to point out, you have a public comment in front of you that was not included in the staff report. It came in at about five o'clock today so.

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

MR. MACMANN: Just to follow up on Commissioner Burns' statement, we have a couple other developments here in town, notably one on Ash, that the driveways are allowed to be used as parking

places. That appears to be very dysfunctional, and this is -- I guess that's why you guys don't include them as in they block people from getting in and out. Would that be the case here?

MR. PALMER: Just generally we don't count tandem spaces because of that issue. For instance, in this instance, if you parked in front of the garage, it can effectively, you know, block your access to the garage. So, you know, typically a visitor would not park in that space, but it's available and so perhaps they would. So, we would count one or the other. And actually, in the instance where the accessible parking space is in front of the garage on this plan, we only count the accessible space, not the garage space. That's why it's 15 instead of 16 garage spaces.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer.

MR. ZENNER: And if I may, Mr. MacMann, in our -- the parking regulations do permit tandem parking but only be counted as accessible parking to the parking requirements in the R-1 and the R-2 zoning district. That is specifically called out within the parking section of the code. R-MF and anything beyond that that has multi-family does not allow for tandem parking. So, this zoning district specifically excludes the ability to do that. And to further clarify, this is not R-MF that we're seeking. It's a planned district, and in a planned district parking modifications of the total number of spaces is also a permissible alteration. So while we have taken a position that the tandem spaces are not being counted as part of the parking allotment for the purposes that we've just discussed, the Planning Commission, should you choose to make that decision or interpretation otherwise, you could say that the 15 spaces that are in front of the garages are additional parking spaces. We would contend that they're not because of the exact matters that we just discussed. And if you pack your garage full of stuff and you don't park in your garage, where are you parking as a tenant. You are parking in the driveway and, therefore, it negates the additional parking space.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? I'd like to offer that we got an exhibit as part of this last submission that identified an accessible route going in front of the garages. And you cannot park in the accessible route. So, based on where the accessible route is going, no one's going to be parking in front of the garages. Typically, I would require a wheel stop in order to protect the accessible route to ensure we have 36 inches minimum, but obviously putting a wheel stop in the driveway leading to a garage would be problematic. Mr. Palmer, can you tell me, I was confused about the setbacks as well. Can you tell me which street this property is addressed at?

MR. PALMER: It will be addressed off of Green Meadows Road because that's where the access is taking place. I believe it's currently not addressed because it's undeveloped, but.

MS. LOE: The Green Meadows Road would be considered the front yard?

MR. PALMER: Correct.

MS. LOE: Which for multi-family would have a 25-foot setback?

MR. PALMER: I believe so.

MS. LOE: If this were a multi-family. All right. Thank you. Seeing no additional questions for staff, we will open up the public comment period. If we have more than one speaker, we do limit public

speakers to three minutes apiece. If you're representing a group, we'll give you six minutes. You do need to give us your name and address for the record. So public comments.

MR. KELLY: Good evening. My name is Matt Kelly, 911 Crestland Avenue. I'm the owner and developer of the Godfrey Plan development. The Godfrey name has significance to me, my family, and this specific development. This land was formerly owned by, originally owned by the Godfrey family. I myself am a third-generation real estate entrepreneur, born and raised here in Columbia. I plan to have a consistent presence in the Godfrey development by not just building the developing, but also maintaining and operating this for years to come. My wife and I chose to move to Columbia because we love the city. It's a great place to raise a family, establish roots and invest in the community. Similar to the Godfrey family I hope and plan to keep the Godfrey Plan development in my family and eventually pass it down to my kids one day. In the Godfrey PD I'm proposing four multi-family buildings with four two bedrooms, two bath units in each building. Each unit will have a one-car garage with direct access into their unit. There will be eight units that are on the ground floor. Our hope is to rent this to elderly tenants that like the neighborhood and the location. Each unit offers a proven floor plan of an open concept that feels like a single-family home. Our goal in this plan is to provide affordable homes on the south side of Columbia with craftsmanship and a quality finish. We want the Godfrey to be people's homes, not just an apartment. I bought this property because I believe it's the best location in Columbia. As the city continues to grow outward, the Godfrey remains pretty centrally located with close proximity to everything. I plan to be a lasting neighbor to the current neighbors and would like to provide a long-term product that enhances the neighborhood and the community. I believe Columbia needs more affordable housing in the future and I believe they need it now and the Godfrey provides that with an innovative design and quality product.

MS. LOE: Are there any questions for this speaker. Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: Yes, sir.

MR. MACMANN: Couple questions. First let's deal with your affordability statement. What are you looking at these things to retail for to the general public? Do you have an estimate?

MR. KELLY: We don't know exactly. You know, we're looking for, you know, just two -- you know, a couple that is a two-income family or, you know, an average income to be able to, you know, afford it. And, you know, I don't know exactly on a range. We don't know, you know, the costs. We're still conceptual.

MR. MACMANN: So, it may or may not be affordable depending upon what the family makes. So that's potentially affordable. I have a --

MR. KELLY: What's the definition of affordable.

MR. MACMANN: I had a question. This is a philosophical question for you, and I'm not springing anything on you.

MR. KELLY: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: The neighbors are less than happy about this.

MR. KELLY: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: The city staff are less than happy about this.

MR. KELLY: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: Staff has asked you to reduce it by 25 percent. I think that may make some of the neighbors happier too. Why not do that?

MR. KELLY: Why not just reduce it by 25 percent?

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MR. KELLY: We definitely can, but right now, I mean, the density is, I think it's supported by the density in the properties beside us on Troyer and, you know, maybe not Crescent Greens. But I myself reached out to a handful of neighbors and have some comments of the people on Crescent Greens and other neighbors and --

MR. MACMANN: I have spoken with folks in Crescent Green. Okay. It appears we have -- that many people have -- that people have different philosophical views on what's crowded, what's heavy on traffic, what's --

MR. KELLY: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: -- affordable.

MR. KELLY: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: That's --

MR. KELLY: Absolutely.

MR. MACMANN: I'm just going to put that out there. I don't have any more questions. Thank you very much.

MR. KELLY: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? Ms. Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: Hi. Sorry I'm way over here.

MR. KELLY: That's all right.

MS. JONES: So, I think your goals are laudable. I think there are some real concerns that you're trying to do too much with this piece. I mean, what -- you've heard us talking about the parking issues and the accessibility issues. You're talking about trying to rent these to senior citizens. Is that right?

MR. KELLY: Yes, ma'am.

MS. JONES: So I guess you've got -- it just seems like -- I think your goals are in the right place; I'm just curious as to how you think putting senior citizens in a place where they can or cannot get a walker, a wheelchair, a cane in and out of their home is accomplishing those goals.

MR. KELLY: That's a good question. The furthest east building, if you want to -- I mean, we can go back, but the first east building is handicap accessible, so, you know, that's going to be a majority of -- like I said, there's eight units on the ground floor so they're enveloped on top of each other. I know you can't see that right now, but eight units will be on the floor. That would be, you know, accessible with

those steps. You walk right up and park your car in the garage. And then there will be eight above that; they'll be enveloped on top of each other. So yeah, you might not -- you know, we're not -- our target market isn't necessarily going to be just senior citizens, but there's a lot of people that love this area and, you know, love the neighborhood. There are just people walking. You know, if you go just drove by there at five o'clock, there's a ton of people walking and, you know, it's a highly sought-after area.

MS. JONES: Okay.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? Ms. Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: I'm concerned about the -- well, I'm concerned about a lot of things with this, but the 15-foot setback that you've designed in here that's going to be on Green Meadows Road. You talk about people love to walk by here and that this is a beautiful area. It is beautiful. It's a beautiful green space. Fifteen feet does not give them a whole bunch of space to be able to walk with their kids safely on Green Meadows Road at particular times of the day, non-pandemic times, but particular times of the day. Why couldn't you make a different design that allows for an adequate setback there on Green Meadows Road?

MR. KELLY: Yes, ma'am. I can let my engineer Jay to answer the setbacks question. I believe it is 25 is what Rusty said on a multi-family I believe, but he can answer that question. The maximum we have actually is that east building and it's encroaching that; it's 18.7 feet. So yeah, it is a difference of 3.7 feet from the 15 feet, but that was just originally how the plat was platted with the Rock Bridge Christian Church.

MS. RUSSELL: I could be more impressed with doing something there if there was more green space left to keep it looking the way it does.

MR. KELLY: Yeah. I totally --

MS. RUSSELL: So, thank you.

MS. LOE: Additional questions? Mr. Kelly, I have a question. You're asking for a design exception from the requirement to provide a front entrance toward the street. And one of the reasons we have that requirement in our code is to provide a sense of community and neighborhood. Can you tell me what this project is offering in lieu of? So, if you're not giving us an entrance or if you're not giving the neighborhood an entrance, what are you offering to the neighborhood to provide a sense of community and as a benefit back to the neighborhood?

MR. KELLY: I would just say, you know, housing that people -- a place to house people in a good quality apartment, you know, that feels like a single-family home for people that want that specific location close by to maybe their office or close by to Murry's or whatever it is.

MS. LOE: But can't you do that in a way that builds the neighborhood as well? I mean, the way you're showing it short of feels like it's turning its back on the neighborhood and you're asking for this design exception to do this.

MR. KELLY: Well, when we originally --

MS. LOE: We don't -- we don't -- sorry.

MR. KELLY: Go ahead. Sorry.

MS. LOE: I was just going to say, I mean, when you ask for an exception, there needs to be a good reason, or you need to be offering something in lieu of to some extent.

MR. KELLY: Yes. So are you asking about the exception to take the access onto Green -- from Green Meadows Road. Correct?

MS. LOE: No. I'm asking why you're not putting the front doors toward the street.

MR. KELLY: Oh. For the furthest east building? Are you asking for the furthest east building?

MS. LOE: For any of the buildings.

MR. KELLY: Oh. Well, I can let Cody answer that. I think he's actually touching --

MS. LOE: All right.

MR. KELLY: -- touching base on that.

MS. LOE: Okay. Thank you. Any additional questions? I see none. Thank you.

MR. DARR: Commissioners. I'm Cody Darr. I'm an engineer at A Civil Group. Office is at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. I'm just going to be touching on a few on the items I would like to explain, hopefully clarify for the Commission. Jay Gebhardt and Kevin Murphy are also going to be offering support on a couple other issues. First, I'd like to talk about the lot configurations, specifically the new fourplexes' units' proximity to Green Meadows Road. Counter to the review, comments of staff report, we don't believe we reversed course from generally applicable setbacks. It's always been our intention to utilize the 15-foot setback which we incorporate into the original concept layout is a 15-foot setback on that road in which we submitted, and the P&Z has in their information. We believed and still believe the final layout provides adequate setback. The additional units proposed from what staff suggested was an attempt to increase density while still preserving the generous green space. Actual green space is nearly identical from the concept plan, 50 percent to 51 percent, while adding additional density; therefore, being a more efficient design and promoting environmentally sound and efficient use of the property which is a goal of the comprehensive plan. This layout does correspond to two building corners encroaching into the staff requested 25-foot setback while the building -- the buildings are laid out to be 18.7 feet and 20.3 feet respectively from the right-of-way. The actual physical area of the building that's closer than 25 feet will only be 40 square feet for the east building and 22 square feet for the southwest building. To bring this into perspective, the code already allows for certain portions of the building such as awnings, ledges, sills, et cetera of a building to encroach 60 square feet into a setback. The potential adverse impact, visual impacts of the areas of the buildings closest to the road have been mitigated by our self-imposed additional landscaping requirements. The owners consulted landscaper and intends to incorporate screening landscaping for both these corners. From a technical standpoint it's my professional opinion that the planned building locations would not cause any adverse impacts to limit the City's ability for future construction or improvement on Green Meadows as suggested in the staff report. The buildings' proximity to the right-of-way will not affect the ability for the City to work with an established right-of-way and easements. The existing Green Meadows right-of-way already meets the

City's required width of 66 feet and required easement with the ten feet. Accessibility of the site is intended to be in compliance with the Fair Housing Act. I believe this is accomplished with additional minor sidewalk connections as shown on the attached accessibility exhibit. We propose the PD plan be approved subject to technical revisions to this effect including updating impervious areas, which is mentioned as a condition on the staff report. Parking is intended to meet the code requirements. The issue I understand staff had with the originally designed handicapped space is that it's in front of the garage. It's intended to be used by the resident of that unit. However, since this apparently doesn't meet the rules of the code, we would propose to move both the spaces to the row of spaces south of the east building. This revision would not change the ultimate parking provided calculations. We still would be proposing 37 spaces. We can revise the plan to differentiate between garage and on-site surface spaces as indicated in the staff report, if you desire. So those are the items I was going to talk about. If you have any questions about those specifically, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

MS. LOE: Any questions for this speaker? Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick. This is a general question. If this is a Jay question, that's fine; I can --

MR. DARR: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: -- ask him when Mr. Gebhardt gets up there. Already at the intersection of Green Meadows Circle and Green Meadows Road it's dodgy. It's relatively unsafe. And you guys are proposing, Mr. Kelly's proposing to add a driveway just a few feet down from that. I question the wisdom of that.

MR. DARR: All I can go off is the technical guidance. It meets the codes and regulations and best practice for that as far as how that street exists today. Staff has looked at this, the Public Works Department. They don't have a problem with the location. Other than that, I don't know what -- I mean, yeah. There's probably a lot of traffic on that road.

MR. MACMANN: It does meet the minimum standard. It does. The roadway is already -- I'm sure many of you here have driven this particular road particularly either in the morning or at night when we're coming home. It certainly requires the full attention of drivers going in both directions on both roads and this will add to that. This is a concern for me and a concern for the neighbors from what we've heard. So, I mean, you guys -- I mean, yes, if that's your answer that it meets the technical requirements, it does; I'll grant that. It's still a concern. Thank you.

MR. DARR: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Ms. Burns.

MS. BURNS: Just quickly, did you do any type of traffic studies or any traffic impact when you were looking at the development?

MR. DARR: We did a cursory examination of that analysis. I think this site generates a hundred, 106 trips a day, ADT. I think that road, I don't have a recent count. I checked the most recent that was published which was from mid-2000s or 2013 and it was around 10,000. So, it's about 1 percent of what

is actually already there. Less than a lot of the other driveways from the multi-family that go on to that road right now.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? Ms. Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: So human beings being what we are, how does your plan take into account that if I lived on this site, I would use the back entrance every time? I wouldn't try to pull out on Green Meadows. I would use where I think the plan said the dumpsters are supposed to go. So, I'm just wondering, like, how -- have you taken that into account? Is that an actual usable entrance? Is there something to prevent that from happening?

MR. DARR: Yeah. It's actually not connected. So, taking into account the multiple neighborhood meetings and correspondence we've had with them over the years, they really did not want any direct access to Green Meadows Circle. And so, we did take that in account and there is no driveway access to -- no vehicular driveway access from the units to Green Meadows Circle. They all have to use Green Meadows Road.

MS. JONES: Okay. So it looks like, and maybe I'm just not great at reading the plans, but it looks like even though that's where the dumpsters are, there's a way for vehicles to come in and out off of Green Meadows Circle.

MR. DARR: No, there's not.

MS. JONES: You're saying that's not the case?

MR. DARR: Just there is access to the dumpster right there.

MS. JONES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: But the dumpster would be required to be fully enclosed. Is that correct?

MR. DARR: Yes, I believe so.

MR. ZENNER: So, there will be a wall, there will be a screening wall on its back side.

MS. LOE: Additional questions? I have a question. If you're moving the accessible parking over to the row of ten parking stalls, accessible parking needs to connect to an accessible route so that means a bit more sidewalk.

MR. DARR: There would be sidewalk in front of those three spaces or two handicap and an aisle.

MS. LOE: Right. Okay. Thank you.

MR. DARR: I mean, we like the way that this was set up. It was our idea, but we're not -- I mean, we'll do what's the technical and what's the best practice. So, we would propose to change that if the Commission wants to go with staff's recommendation of moving those spaces.

MS. LOE: You can't tell someone that needs an accessible parking stall that they have to live in that unit.

MR. DARR: I think I probably wouldn't want to speak to that because I don't know all the interior rules on what units -- I know --

MS. LOE: The Fair Housing Act is those --

MR. DARR: Yeah. All those units --

MS. LOE: -- two accessible parking stalls need to be available to all of the ground floor units.

MR. DARR: And I think they would be.

MS. LOE: But that means it's --

MR. DARR: But some units --

MS. LOE: -- blocking that garage. I don't think it's a stall. It's not drawn as a stall. You put a logo on the driveway, but there's no stall line. I think it was mis--

MR. DARR: A fully accessible unit is different than just meeting the Fair Housing. Or is that not correct?

MS. LOE: We're talking accessible parking stalls versus units.

MR. DARR: Okay. And they still would be --

MS. LOE: All the units need to have accessible entrances on the ground floor. Correct?

MR. DARR: Yeah. I think -- yeah. We would intend to -- if this isn't achieving that, then yes, we would need to move them down.

MS. LOE: Yeah. If -- I mean, if you want that garage to be used at all. I think Mr. Palmer had it correct. If you want to count that as an accessible parking stall --

MR. DARR: Well, we're not double counting that space. We're only counting one.

MS. LOE: Then you're not counting the garage?

MR. DARR: No, not for that particular unit.

MS. LOE: So that unit doesn't get a garage?

MR. DARR: It gets a garage; it's just --

MS. LOE: Not a parking garage.

MR. DARR: You could park in it. If the handicapped-accessible person would like to park in the garage, or they could park in their driveway. It only counts as one.

MS. LOE: No, because that parking stall has to be available to anyone, any other tenants or any visitor that wants to use it.

MR. DARR: Yeah.

MS. LOE: So that means I can never park in my garage.

MR. DARR: And that's why I'm saying that's what was -- why we were moving it, because of that conflict.

MS. LOE: I would recommend moving it so you can offer that tenant their garage.

MR. DARR: Yes.

MS. LOE: All right. But that just means more sidewalk than what we're seeing in this plan. That and the sidewalk over to the public sidewalk and sidewalk over to the dumpster, we're -- there's more paving than what we're seeing in this plan.

MR. DARR: Yeah. When I told you the 50 to 51 percent, I was already including that. Not the 5 foot by 21-foot additional strip, but I was including this connection as shown on the exhibit.

MS. LOE: Thank you. I think we're good.

MR. MURPHY: Madam Chair and commissioners. My name is Kevin Murphy with A Civil Group. Offices at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. One of the things that I want to talk about was density of this project. Rusty, there's -- could you put that density display up on the board there.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. We don't have it in the presentation.

MR. ZENNER: I'll just hand it to us.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MR. MURPHY: Basically, what this is showing -- and I'll wait until that comes up there, so I can talk about something else. So, this layout, this property is currently zoned R-1. R-1 has a density of 6.2 units per acre. We're asking 11 units per acre. Multi-family are in full R-MF is 17 units per acre. So, we're in the middle of those two densities and actually closer to R-1 than we are to R-MF. I can just hold this up briefly. I don't think this was submitted either. This is an R-1 layout showing nine units on there. That's a little bit less dense than 6.2. Actually, if we could, we could fit nine lots on there. Well, actually it says seven lots. Because of the restrictions of access on to Green Meadows Road for R-1 properties, we would have five; in this layout we'd have five driveways coming on to Green Meadows Circle. Again, access on Green Meadows Circle has been pshawed by most everyone I know of. Commissioner MacMann spoke of the access on Green Meadows Road. Again, there's much more dense developments dumping on to Green Meadows Road through single accesses. This has been looked at by all the professionals in the city staff and they've agreed this is the appropriate place to put the access. So, looking at this Green Meadows or this density exhibit, the first one showing our site, the Godfrey, at 11 units per acre proposed. Crescent Green across the street is, it's six from the PUD because it counts the area to the west of there, but in the -- on the lot itself where the development is, it's actually eight units per acre. And I would say that's probably only the development short of ours that has anywhere near 50 percent green space versus any of these other ones. The Goodson development which is basically right at the intersection of Green Meadows Circle and Green Meadows Road, 17 units per acre. Bentlage subdivision is nine units per acre. Fireside, 14. I think that's recently gone up potentially. And then Village South, 13. Again, some of the -- as Cody had mentioned, this is the most efficient design. This is an infill development which is what everyone wants to do instead of pushing the city limits out, and density inside the city is something that again is promoted regularly by staff and commission and council. To go to some of the other points that were made, if I could touch on those real quick. You had asked about a 15-foot setback or mentioned that that would be dangerous for people walking on the sidewalk. The sidewalk is currently in there. It is where it is. We're not having a building close to it. It's not endangering a person walking. The building's not, you know, coming towards them or anything. That sidewalk is where it is on the street and where it will remain. Chairman Loe had asked about community

benefits with this building. We're asking for a design adjustment for the building being on there. I think we could make a, something that looked like an entrance on the back side of that building. I don't think that's too awful difficult to do, but besides -- besides that, again, we're providing 50 percent green space on this site where most of these other sites are probably somewhere around 25 percent to 30 percent, if that. These are the immediately adjacent sites. And again, the access on Green Meadows is what has been vetted and approved.

MS. LOE: Are there any questions for Mr. Murphy? Mr. Murphy, I just had a couple questions on this graph. When I divide 56 by 7.93, I come up with 7.06 which is -- and I tend to round down not up. But this shows 8.

MR. MURPHY: I'm sorry. Where?

MS. LOE: Oh, on the Crescent Green.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MS. LOE: I'm coming up with a density closer to seven units per acre. The other ones are pretty good, except Bentlage. I'm coming up with density closer to the eight on that one. So just some of the numbers seemed a little inflated to me.

MR. MURPHY: Someone else in our office did those.

MS. LOE: I understand. I just, I round down when it's less than .5 so that, I took that into consideration when I looked at this chart.

MR. MURPHY: Sure. So, yeah, again, the -- we're right in the middle. So, with Crescent Green we end at whatever you said, seven.

MS. LOE: 7.06.

MR. MURPHY: And then Goodson right across the street, we're right in the middle of those two and our density's right in the middle of their densities.

MS. LOE: Right. Those are a little further down the road, so.

MR. MURPHY: Goodson is right there at the intersection.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any additional questions? I don't see any. Thank you.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you, Clint. Good evening. My name's Jay Gebhardt. I'm a civil engineer with A Civil Group here in Columbia and just going to wrap up our presentation with this. First, I'd like to address some of the questions that were asked of Matt in the beginning and there was a question of why 16 units instead of 12. And again, you know, this is hard decisions that you all have to make is do you want density, do you want affordable. And when I say affordable, I mean, it's going to rent for less money if there's 16 units than if there's 12. Same parking, you've got the same expense. So, if you guys truly want to see affordable housing, you're going to have to see density. And so how do we create that in a way that makes it acceptable is we found, or Matt found a unit that works really, really well. It's, you know, basically the size of a single family, two-story single-family home. And that's why. You know, it's just money. And if you guys want to see more expensive units, rent units, then we'll have less units. If you want to see the price of the units go down, we have more units. So, it's your choice.

And also, there was a thing about this being green space. This is zoned R-1. As Kevin pointed out, we have a layout we're prepared to come forward with of seven single-family homes and there would be no green space. It would just be front yards and the yards. So, I just want to make sure that that's where we're starting at. We're not starting with an empty field. We're starting with what the rights are we have today on that property with R-1 zoning. My experience with this lot began in 2001 subdividing it for the church. Then with the subdivision so the church could sell this lot. And after sold, I worked for the Kendall Company, their request for commercial that was ultimately denied at City Council. So, I've been around this piece of property quite a long time. I've met with a lot of neighbors on this. We met again with the neighbors in September of last year. And originally our proposal was a 10,000 square foot office building with 12 units. And as you can imagine, that did not go over very well with the neighbors. But some things came out of that meeting, like they said you need to provide adequate parking because Green Meadows Circle has no room for parking on it. So, we have, I believe, done that. They also were adamant about the entrance being off of Green Meadows Road and not Green Meadows Circle. Apparently, the traffic backs up quite a way on Green Meadows Circle at certain times of the day and they just didn't want any more traffic added to Green Meadows Circle at all. So, we talked to staff, traffic engineer, planning, and even in the planning staff report they support that. You know, in the meetings it became crystal clear too that we are dealing with a PD zone here and there were some things in the staff report that talks about the purpose of a PD district. It's written as a general statement and I don't believe the purpose was had a 1.4-acre parcel in mind when it was written. However, we have incorporated enhanced amenities in the form -- my glasses are fogging up -- we incorporated enhanced amenities in the form of attached garages. Normally apartments don't have a garage you can walk from one to the other. Highly out-- landscaped outdoor spaces for the enjoyment of the tenants, and a housing type that's currently not available in any apartments nearby. We really do feel like this is an appropriate design. And, you know, I see this from a different perspective than staff and I kind of blame myself for not talking to staff more about our vision here. But the bird's eye view of this is always a poor view. It just doesn't lend itself because no one sees it from that. You see it from the ground level looking at it. And what I see is a two-story building that has four units in it but is no different in scale than a lot of single-family two-story homes.

MS. LOE: Mr. Gebhardt, are you willing to take questions from commissioners?

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes.

MS. LOE: Are there any questions for this speaker? I see -- Ms. Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: I appreciate what you're aiming for in terms of affordability and I also appreciate the discussion around scale. It does put us at kind of an uncomfortable juxtaposition where there are conflicting goals in the plan for several of these things. We want a livable community and we want a community that supports affordable housing, and those are part of the same thing. What I'm concerned about is that we frequently get proposals asking us to prioritize density in the name of affordable housing. We don't really have a definition of what that affordable housing is going to be. I know that Commissioner

MacMann asked what they would be renting at and I understand that you can't define that yet, but without some sort of target definition of affordable housing, I feel uncomfortable with this.

MR. GEBHARDT: I feel your pain. It's hard to understand what affordable housing really means when you start thinking about it. I'm sure there's definitions based on median household income and --

MS. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. GEBHARDT: -- things like that. So, I've come up with a different term. It's called workforce housing. We're talking about teachers, nurses, police, fire, just the typical workforce type thing. Maybe that's the median household income, maybe it's more than the median household income, I don't know. But that's the target. Retirees are another target.

MS. CARROLL: I understand the people who are the target.

MR. GEBHARDT: Okay.

MS. CARROLL: I don't understand the rate that is the target. Do you have a percentage median household income that is a target or a range there or is that still too far out to define in the planning process?

MR. GEBHARDT: You know, the cost of lumber doubled from March to now.

MS. CARROLL: I know.

MR. GEBHARDT: So, it's really hard to say we're going to rent this for X amount because we don't know when we start building this next year what the cost of things are going to be.

MS. CARROLL: Yep.

MR. GEBHARDT: And I'm sorry I can't answer that, but, you know, that is a valid question. We're really not trying to say this is affordable for people in the 40 percent of the median household income. That's not our target. So, we want to make this so that it's young professionals, young families, or retirees. And I think the density part of this I think it would be pretty challenging to find another place that's 50 percent open space and has 11 units per acre. And that is because of this unit that we've chosen. And yes, we've gone vertical to do that. So, you know, that's the cost of that. But again, for scale of that, I mean, you have a 35-foot maximum height in R-1 zoning which is what we're zoned now. We still have a 35-foot height limit now. So, we're not doing anything that we wouldn't be allowed to do in an R-1 as far as height. And as far as scale of this, these units are about 60 feet wide and they're about 60 feet deep, so they're, you know, they're not huge footprints. And we really don't -- I mean, when was the last time you saw a fourplex built in Columbia. It's been a while. There are some older ones, but typically you see, you know, 24-unit, 36-unit large apartment buildings three stories tall. That seems to be the economy of this. So, this is a unique product and it is something that we're trying to do here. And again, I didn't do a very good job explaining this to staff and so I think maybe we'd have gotten a little better staff report if I had, so. But that's my answer to your question unless you need further.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: As some of you may know I've spent a couple minutes on what is affordable and what is workforce housing. And that was one of the reasons I was trying to get Mr. Kelly to talk about

some kind of number. Just so we know what we're talking about, affordable housing for the not as fortunate as some and more fortunate than others is less than \$853 a month. Workforce housing as you described it, the feds have a pretty good metric; it's kind of a -- it's .8 of AMI and .2 of AMI. You guys don't need to know about that. It's kind of like right in the middle. We're looking from 853 to about 1,175, we can tweak the higher end up there, per unit per month.

MR. GEBHARDT: Right. I --

MR. MACMANN: I mean, you guys --

MR. GEBHARDT: If you wanted a range --

MR. MACMANN: Yeah.

MR. GEBHARDT: -- I would say these are not going to rent for less than a thousand dollars.

MR. MACMANN: I would -- I was doing the numbers, and I don't think so either. I think they're going to be --

MR. GEBHARDT: No. And I don't think they'll rent for more than 15, 16 hundred, but that's kind of hard to say. And that upper end is not where we want to be. We want to be on the lower end of that range.

MR. MACMANN: Well, I don't know -- I don't know what you guys pay, but I was figuring average rents Columbia, 1,400. That's just back of the -- back of the fingernail type thing.

MR. GEBHARDT: I think our rule of competition here is what is the average cost of a single-family home in this area which would -- what would your payment be with taxes, insurance, and principal and all that.

MR. MACMANN: Single family home in that neighborhood, 15 to 19 depending on where it's at.

MR. GEBHARDT: Yeah. To me that's the competition because we're trying to make these more as homes.

MR. MACMANN: And the further we go down the street, the bigger that number gets.

MR. GEBHARDT: Right.

MR. MACMANN: I just, the reason I brought that up is we went from affordable to workhouse to young professional. And I get what you want to -- guys do, that's awesome. I'm all for infill. I have a problem with how big it is. You know, just. And it's -- if it wasn't that two rows there, if it was enough intersection that's so busy, I'd be good with it. That's what -- we've approved other things that are infill, not many, you're right, not many because not many come forward.

MR. GEBHARDT: But you'll see, you know, this is one of the last pieces in this neighborhood to be developed. There's another corner at Bethel but it'll probably not be this. So, you're kind of, you know, punishing us with traffic issues that were generated by the neighbors that don't want the traffic.

MR. MACMANN: Well, I can't -- I appreciate that and I've thought about that when you were speaking. Because Fireside and the others may be too big for where they are, I don't think the current neighbors should pay for more traffic. You can take that argument and just completely flip it around. Anyway, thank you, Mr. Gebhardt. Thank you very much.

MR. GEBHARDT: Anyone else have any questions? Thank you.

MS. LOE: I see none. Thank you.

MR. MENDOZA: Can I take it off.

MS. LOE: I don't know if we have a protocol for that. Mr. Zenner, are they required to keep their masks on may they --

MR. ZENNER: They can remove their mask.

MS. LOE: They can remove them.

MR. MENDOZA: I'm David Mendoza, 315 Green Meadows Circle. So, I live right there. I came prepared to say a couple of things, but after hearing what I'm hearing, I think I want to change. We have lived here since 2011. It's a beautiful city, Columbia is, amazing place to raise a family. It's a fantastic institution. So, we are happy to make, you know, our biggest investment here.

MS. RUSSELL: Would you speak into the microphone please. Thank you.

MR. MENDOZA: Is this better?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes.

MR. MENDOZA: Oh, yeah, I can hear now. So, I will be the first one to recognize that -- well, I was saying that we came here, we choose to be in Columbia. Columbia's a fantastic place to raise your family. Go Mizzou. Now, I'll be the first one to recognize that this is a challenging plot to do something with. It's in the middle of somewhere, but I love -- I like to point out that it is the entrance of two big neighborhoods. Right. So that's going to be the first thing that people will see when they go into our neighborhoods. And probably you read correspondence; all the three neighborhood associations wrote against this plan. I can only guess, and I can only speak for me. We made our biggest investment in that house and so whatever is built there is going to be the presentation part for my neighborhood, for my investment, for my family. And I also want to pass that to my family. Right. So, I'm not against building something there. I'm actually certain that at some point has to be rezoned, something has to be built there. What I'm saying and again, I'm just speaking for myself, give us something exciting. Give us something that will really increase the visibility of the neighborhood and I will be up for it. I guess the plan, or the words are innovative and creative, and if I see something innovative and creative, I will be absolutely up for it. That's it.

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

MS. SHAW: Rebecca Shaw, 2615 Vail Drive. I'm speaking as a resident of a close neighborhood as well as the team lead for Rock Bridge Christian Church Social Justice Team. We sent a letter I believe to the commissioners before the previous meeting and a few of the points have been brought up by members and I appreciate very much some of the questions I've heard because it feeds a lot into what we've been thinking. As we think about obstacles to economic dignity in this city, we think quite a bit about how do we get a mixed-income neighborhood whenever we're talking about things, not just affordable housing and bringing in and stacking people. And I -- I really want to say to one of the gentlemen that came up here, he said if you want affordability, you're going to have to have density. That

struck me wrong because we do not need to take people of lesser means and stack and pile them on top of one another in order to give them housing. People deserve a home with backyard and space for their children. And to say that they have to be within small means I think is condescending. A lot of my same concerns have been brought up as a resident. Traffic. There are cyclists that get onto the Greenbriar exit access point at that road. There are a lot of people walking with their dogs and their children through that neighborhood. If we were going to add more traffic, as Mr. MacMann said, that -- anybody trying to get from Green Meadows Circle on to Green Meadows Road knows the risk you take when pulling out to make a left from that location. The four-way stop gets backed up day and night at high traffic times. There are community -- there's a community garden just a few spaces over in that same neighborhood. We have the retirement facility and then our church and then this green space that many people in the neighborhood use. I mean, people are out there playing with their dogs a lot. People will play with their kids in that field. It has become one of the few spaces in the neighborhood for folks to just go and have space, so it would be sad to see that go. I do think that a concern would be the blending of the neighborhood. If we're talking about a 35-foot building on the corner, I think especially if it's close to those sidewalks that are already present, that is very different than the setback of the church and the retirement home that is in that same area. Those buildings are kind of in the center portion of their plots of land and there's space around them. So, I think this would be -- it just looks like you're cramming buildings into a small location. To hear rent in the area of a thousand to \$1,500 worries me. We've had a lot of large buildings put up for student housing and for more prominent let's say people on the south side of town. And I would very much like to see this development as an area for people that need the buses to get to places, they need to go, that need to be able to walk to work. So, I would say that if you're looking at a single family, then that sort of price range is probably not going to be in their pocketbook. I just would like to point out that Columbia streets strategic plan calls for home buyers purchasing a home building 50 new homes of efficiency every year, and I don't feel like this change in this zoning would help with that if we're going from a residential zone to a planned district which can be a little bit of everything. We'd ready like to support a strategic plan and try to keep residential areas residential.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Mr. Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Right. So, let's put the other hat on. So, I'm looking for a win-win. Let's put the other hat on. I'm looking for a win-win. I've got thousands of dollars in this land. I have a right to use my land. So, give me a solution so I'm not sitting on thousands of dollars and paying taxes on that land.

MS. SHAW: I understand. I think that it is a very difficult location. I think that originally, if I remember, speaking with the church members it was sold with the intention of putting a dentist office in the location. And I believe it's been through multiple owners since then. So, I don't have the perfect answer. All I can say is that I feel like -- I do feel like apartment, tall apartment complexes with their backs to the rest of the community doesn't feel open and welcoming.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick. To Mr. Stanton's point, by right the owner right now could put, was it nine houses in there. What would you think about that?

MS. SHAW: I would personally like the lower number of people. If we're talking about 16 more people trying to get out at nine o'clock in the morning because they've got to get to work, it's going to congest that area quite a bit more, I think. The original plan seemed more reasonable to me, but.

MR. MACMANN: I'm just -- you know, we've been through --

MS. SHAW: That's me personally.

MR. MACMANN: You're right. This site, this property has been through a lot of stuff. Since I came to town people are pondering what to do with this piece of property, which was a long time ago. But they could literally chop it up, put nine houses in there. And that may -- Mr. Stanton, that may be -- they have that ability right now. They're not restricted. Anyway, this is crosstalk; I don't mean to take your time. Thank you, Ms. Shaw.

MS. SHAW: No, no. You're fine. I think on my end as a homeowner in that area, I would -- I would rather see, you know, nine smaller single-family homes than I would see an apartment complex.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you. Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none, we will close public comment. Commissioner discussion. Ms. Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: I've driven Green Meadows Road probably almost every day since 1987. I drove it before that four-way stop was installed. Matter of fact I drove through that four-way stop many times not even paying attention that it was there. The reason that traffic backs up on Green Meadows Circle is because there's so much traffic on Green Meadows Road and people are trying to get around it to get through there. I've walked that sidewalk with my kids. When I see this complex, I don't understand why you can't drop it 25 percent because when I look at that, I see a big plot of concrete with great big buildings and their backs are pointed to everybody. So, something more pleasant there, something more open to the community, something not as big, something not as parking lot-ish would suit me better to go in there. I'm not going to vote -- I'm not in favor of this. So, thank you.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann and then Mr. Toohey.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you very much. I'd like to second what Ms. Russell said, and I'd like to take us back to the wonderful year of the UDC. One of the things we talked about specifically was seeing the backs of these developments towards the neighborhoods and how that was inappropriate. And we talked about this, Mr. Zenner, about the addressing issue taking care of a lot of this and the planning issues taking care of a lot of it. This would waive the addressing issue, and this would waive the planning. And I'm with Ms. Russell. I drive this a lot. I have friends that live across the street. Green Meadows is kind of dicey right now, particularly in this particular area because you come around and you can't see. I know it's only 100 cars, but we'll probably have 30 to 40 of those trying to get out in the morning and 30 to 40 trying to get in in the evening. It's going to be an issue. And for these reasons I am with Ms. Russell. I would like to see it about 25 percent smaller and I am not going to vote for this.

MS. LOE: Mr. Toohey.

MR. TOOHEY: So, the median house price in this area is \$100,000 more than the median house price for a property north of the highway. So how do you get affordable housing down here when the median house price is already that expensive. The only way to do it is to have more units. So how do you add diversity in these areas if you're going to reduce the amount of units which just draws up the price. So, I'm -- I don't know what I'm voting on this yet; it's just something to think about when it comes to the cost factor.

MS. LOE: Ms. Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: So, I think the density is probably inappropriate, and I'm concerned that everyone involved in this project seems to think that we're talking about 14, 15 hundred dollars a month in rent. I know people who live in the apartments near there. It's nowhere near 14, 15 hundred dollars a month in rent. So now we're talking about building, quote, unquote, nicer affordable housing that's actually not affordable when the alternative is I think five to seven subdivided lots where it's still R-1 zoning. To me that's seems like a much more reasonable number of people for the traffic. It means you've having homeowners which we've all agreed through the planning process is one of our priorities as a city. I just, I don't see how this planned development meets those goals better than an R-1 subdivision.

MS. LOE: Ms. Carroll, Mr. Stanton, then back to Mr. Toohey.

MS. CARROLL: Like I said, before this puts me at an uncomfortable place in values that are in contention with each other. However, like Ms. Geuea said, I don't see this as helping the affordable housing scenario. I don't think that the rents that are likely to come from a new development, even as a new development this size, helps the situation. I understand that more density allows you to make a smaller price, but it's still not going to improve housing affordability to the degree that it needs to in that area. I do particularly want to see more affordable housing at transportation-accessible areas, particularly south of town, and that location seems prime for it. However, if this won't meet the need of affordable housing, then I don't feel comfortable giving up on other goals within our plan if there's no trade off towards improving affordable housing. And I do understand how complex that issue is in terms of building costs. I can't minimize that. I know that the building costs have gone up. But I don't think that we can solve that with this particular issue before us now.

MS. LOE: Mr. Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Kind of directing my comments to Mr. Toohey's. I've heard a lot of things about this. Number one, we're going down this affordable housing road because that's what the developer brought to us. No one told you to say that. You kind of threw it out there, thought it might help you, help your case in front of us. Keep it real. You probably could do that. I'm very involved in the land trust. We do affordable housing. This might not be for you. This might not be the road you want to take. So don't use that as a marketing ploy to maybe get some good folks up here to make us feel good and say, oh, we're going to vote yeah because you're talking about affordable housing and we kind of like that marketing price point or whatever. This might not be that project. Yes, I agree with a lot of the things that

were said as far as backs facing the neighborhood and all that kind of stuff. This might be a good place for middle housing, so the developer may want to look up that and see what middle housing is. And it does address density and you don't have to have people stacked on each other to have good density. That all is involved in middle housing and, you know, a little more innovation. I hope the developer's listening to this, because yes, that back-facing stuff, you're hitting all the bad points of what triggers these kind of conversations. We need to -- and one of the neighbors said, hey, let's do something exciting, do something innovative, sharpen your pencil, read a couple more articles, look at some other stuff, and think about these things a little harder. I love the idea of putting housing there. I just don't want box, Walmart-looking housing. And there is millions of ways to make the neighbors happy. There just is. So, I plan to go with this -- with staff's recommendation, not because I don't like the project; I think you need to open your eyes and think and be more innovative in this area. That's where I'm at with this. And there's plenty of ways to do it. And stop using affordable housing as a marketing ploy to get votes on this end. If you can't make it affordable, you ride the market. Yes, we do need affordable housing. Stop using affordable housing as a marketing ploy to get up and win our hearts and minds. That's just not realistic. Your numbers can't work. Margins don't work. They don't work. So that's all I got to say.

MS. LOE: Mr. Toohey.

MR. TOOHEY: It's -- you're right. It's not affordable housing, but it's more attainable housing in that area where new construction, the median income for new construction property in that area is 316,000. So, I mean, it's impossible to build affordable housing in that area without having more units, so it's more attainable housing.

MS. LOE: Ms. Burns.

MS. BURNS: Yes. Just briefly Mr. Gebhardt mentioned that this property has been kicked around a lot, and I think the reason is because it's one of the last parcels and because it's a difficult piece of property. I think also that it's not an island. It's surrounded by homeowners and neighborhoods that have been there for decades. And I have to listen to those neighborhoods and those homeowners who have property rights also who have fought different issues in this area and continue to try to preserve their family, their family homes, and their neighborhoods. And so, I do not plan to support this.

MS. LOE: Ms. Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: With the affordability issue, 1,400 a month is just -- for two bedrooms is exorbitant. I have a four-bedroom house back in that area and I rent it for 1,300 a month. And 1,400 for an apartment there is not anywhere close to affordable.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Commissioner Russell, that was just my back of the thumbnail sketching. Now, Mr. Gebhardt didn't disagree with that. Certainly, north of 1,200. How about that. I just didn't want to -- okay.

MS. LOE: I would like to say that regardless of the density, the design doesn't convince me that you've actually considered your target groups as you've presented it. You've said that you've designed

this for retirees and for families. However, you at the same time don't have sidewalks going to the public sidewalks, so I cannot walk to the neighboring church, I cannot walk to the community garden, I cannot walk to the nearby retirement home where I might have friends. If this was truly for affordable tenants, I can't walk to the transportation stops. The accessibility was done as an afterthought after we pointed it out on this commission. So instead of driving the design, instead of being the basis to make a universal design, universal for everyone, now, you know, we're talking about it being reachable for people that need those features. It's getting slipped in at the end, and it's a walk that goes by the dumpster. I find that insulting. So no, I don't plan on supporting this because I don't feel as if you have actually designed this for the purpose that you are telling us you are. All right. Any further discussion? Mr. Stanton.

MR. STANTON: There's a lot of ways to address this. Cottages. There's a lot of things on the table that I would like to see this project look into. I just do; I think it can happen. But yeah, I have to agree with my fellow commissioners. A lot of marketing and not a lot of meat behind what you're saying. And just, yeah, green space, you don't have. I mean, it's just -- you've got to work on it a little better. Work on it a little better.

MS. LOE: Ms. Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: If there are no more questions or comments, I think I'd like to form a motion. In the case of 127-2020 I move to approve the requested rezoning from R-1 to PD and the associated PD plan and design exception.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. MacMann. We have a motion the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Ms. Burns.

MS. BURNS: A vote no is going --

MS. LOE: Would deny the motion.

MS. BURNS: Just want to make sure.

MS. LOE: Any other questions? Ms. Burns, may we have roll call please.

MS. BURNS: Yes. Mr. Toohey.

MR. TOOHEY: No.

MS. BURNS: My vote is no. Ms. Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: No.

MS. BURNS: Ms. Loe.

MS. LOE: No.

MS. BURNS: Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: No.

MS. BURNS: Mr. Stanton.

MR. STANTON: No.

MS. BURNS: Ms. Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: No.

MS. BURNS: Ms. Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: No.

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero. Motion is denied.

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner.

MR. ZENNER: Go ahead.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for denial will be forwarded to City Council. We are going to take a five-minute break at this time, and we will be rejoining for the last two cases.

(Off the record.)