

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
JULY 7, 2016

VIII) PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 16-134

A request by Columbia Civil Engineering Group (applicant) on behalf of P1316, LLC (owner) for approval of a major amendment to the "Discovery Office Park North" C-P development plan to accommodate a building expansion. The 5.02-acre subject property is located at the northwest corner of Ponderosa Street and Philips Farm Road, and is also known as Lot 1 of Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 2-B.

Staff report by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed replat.

MS. LOE: Any questions for staff?

MS. RUSHING: I do.

MS. LOE: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: The northeast property line, there is a significant drop in elevation there. What is going to be done to keep all the water in the world from dropping into that residential area?

MR. SMITH: We actually did discuss a little bit of the grades on the site, and I'll let Mr. Hall discuss that specifically. I believe they have considered stormwater drainage, and there is -- again, to go back to my earlier statement, there is a very specific way stormwater is handled on this site. So I'll let him address that because I know that is something that they pay close attention to with this development.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MS. LOE: Any other questions? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: During your presentation of pervious and impervious, you lost me too.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: Could we go over that again?

MR. SMITH: Sure.

MR. MACMANN: We started at two acres.

MR. SMITH: Correct. Two acres of pervious. So two acres of generally open space.

MR. MACMANN: All right. All right. And now we are down to 1.2?

MR. SMITH: Correct.

MR. MACMANN: That's 30,000 feet.

MR. SMITH: Square feet. Yeah. It's about a 40 percent reduction now -- 35,000 square feet.

Yes.

MR. MACMANN: This concerns me. And it dovetails Ms. Rushing's concern also. And from what I understand from the earlier development -- and forgive me, I wasn't here -- there has been some,

like, credit trading of what can be done in areas so the whole area balances out? Was that the objective of what -- that was going on there?

MR. SMITH: Yes. Yes.

MR. MACMANN: All right.

MR. SMITH: And I'll point again to the worksheet. You can kind of see generally the top box within the Exhibit A of the worksheet. It specifies basically the allotted amount of impervious, which is 15 acres for the entire portion of Tract 9. And, I apologize, I don't have the total area of Tract 9. And so they -- they basically -- each time they do a development, they calculate how much impervious is in that and they plug it into the worksheet. So we keep a running total of how much impervious is within Tract 9. And so the stormwater facility, which you don't see here, which is to the south of this property, which is the -- this whole lot here is dedicated to stormwater management. And so I think -- I think the vast majority of everything on this lot will be draining through. And again, I'll let Mr. Hall talk some more of specifics on how it is being handled, but this is my kind of platting view of how it is supposed to work. I do believe they are capturing a small amount of stormwater, but I think the vast majority will run basically through this site as well and be managed in this stormwater -- the quantity plus quality issues will be managed here. And then I think -- I believe it drains into the lake as well as kind of the terminus of the stormwater system there. So it's -- it was a system that I think was a design prior to the stormwater ordinance being approved, and so I think this was something that had actually quite a bit of detail associated with it because we didn't have a stormwater ordinance at this time, but it was meant to more or less mirror what a stormwater ordinance would require. So we -- every time we go through this, it's not -- it's not as easy as saying they just need to meet the stormwater ordinance. They have a specific almost self-contained stormwater ordinance that we have to make sure that they following every time they do a development in--

MR. MACMANN: Is the nature of the --

MR. SMITH: Discovery Park, so --

MR. MACMANN: -- laws at the time in the initial agreement?

MR. SMITH: I'm sorry?

MR. MACMANN: Did you follow me?

MR. ZENNER: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: I did. And that is correct, Mr. MacMann. And at the time that this was approved in 2004 when the annexation request was being done, this is all part of the Bonne Femme Watershed. Part of this site, part of the overall Discovery property for Philips Farm Tract, as it is known is north of what is now Gans Road and the interchange -- and we have Bonne Femme. We had a Bonne Femme Watershed Plan, so there was a high level of design detail associated with stormwater management on this site with its own stormwater management mitigation plan. Mr. Hall and I began working on this when the Odles acquired this property, and it is very complex. The spreadsheet that Mr. Smith included was

actually developed out of the original revisions to this tract in order to be able to satisfy our current stormwater staff that the provisions of the ordinance that annexed this property and established that stormwater plan were not only meeting the ordinance requirements, but were also meeting our current stormwater management regulations. This is the -- it is almost a duality of review process that you have to meet the water quality and the stormwater plan specific for Philips Farm, and then you have to also satisfy that those provisions are meeting our current stormwater standards adopted in 2007.

MR. MACMANN: I appreciate that, Director Zenner. I just -- it's a really big area.

MR. ZENNER: Oh, it's an enormous area.

MR. MACMANN: And I want to pay attention to it.

MR. ZENNER: And the other thing that we have to acknowledge as well -- and it's not the -- the Coverage requirements per tract because of the way that this overall agreement is set up, while you have 15 acres of maximum impervious surface on Tract 9, embedded within the overall annexation agreement are provisions that allow for impervious surface areas that are not being used in other tracts above, in essence, Gans were not draining to the pond -- the Philips Lake are allowed to be transferred between --

MR. MACMANN: Traded off.

MR. ZENNER: tracts.

MR. MACMANN: Traded off.

MR. ZENNER: So if we were to have made this particular location 100 percent impervious, that is permitted under the way that the original annexation agreement is --

MR. MACMANN: As long as the swap takes place.

MR. ZENNER: As long as the swap takes place. So what we have had to do as we have developed this parcel out in its pieces is we have had to manage through the calculation side of this how much total impervious surface is left.

MR. MACMANN: It's a running total that includes something beyond --

MR. ZENNER: Yes. I'm constantly --

MR. MACMANN: (Inaudible).

MR. ZENNER: -- updating. So Mr. Hall can explain it probably more gracefully than we can, but it is extremely complex, and we are managing it.

MR. MACMANN: That was my question for the moment. Thank you, Ms. Loe.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none. Let's open the floor to the public and let -- let the man say what he can.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. HALL: Michael Hall, 4224 Philips Farm Road, Columbia Civil Engineering Group. Thank you for letting me have this opportunity to speak tonight. As we discussed and Mr. Zenner alluded to, this is a very complicated situation. In fact, the calculations took a long time for he and I to come up with something that we both felt comfortable with, and this took over a series of a couple months actually just to get that stormwater down to something that we could manage that we felt comfortable with so that you

all would also feel comfortable that we are meeting the intent of the stormwater ordinance. Mr. Smith, would you go back to the proposed development plan? I want to address a couple of things. One was mentioned that -- Ms. Rushing, you mentioned the grades. You are correct. One of the things that is good about this plan is that the previous plan had a three-to-one slope coming off the back of the buildings that we had proposed to the property line. This actually works better with the existing grades. We are -- actually, we have -- we are going to come down, and because we have a loading dock, the building will be elevated and the road will be suppressed in more of a flat run to the property line. So we have actually got a deeper section that is going to be at a more gentle grade than what we had originally proposed. The other thing that we are going to do is we are looking at the stormwater that was discharging to the north, the area prior to any of our mass grading. We have got that data, and we -- to do the calculations, we're going to make sure that we do not discharge any more to the north than was done prior to any development, which again, that's how we are kind of having to blend the current ordinance and what we have in the development agreement ordinance as well. So we have a lot of things we are looking at and we're going to keep those things put together. One of the other things I am looking at through final design is tweaking the north so that we actually have a wider buffer than six feet. I think we've actually -- Mr. Smith actually has it potentially going to ten foot. So when the final development plans come in, it's hopefully going to be better, which I think is going to be -- for a multitude of things, it's going to help from a -- the buffer be more sustainable long term, and it will also give a little bit more comfort that what we are doing is in the spirit of what we are proposing. The other thing is to note that this particular -- the long building, we are intending on having the shingled roofs like we do on the south, and we're going to run all the stormwater off all the roof to the front of the buildings -- route them around so they're not discharging to the back. So that is another intent. Other than that, we're going to do the typical low-impact development methods that we have had on the rest of the projects that we have done out here -- disconnected downspout drains, making it go through grass swales, and so forth. We're going to incorporate curb cuts in the parking lots versus just putting in inlets. All those things are going to be incorporated into this. It does a couple things -- it's actually one of the cases where low impact development is a win for both the developer and the environment because you put in less pipe and it's less cost, but it also helps the environment because you are filtering the water before it gets into the pipe system. So that is the beauty of being able to incorporate these two things together. Beyond that, we've got it parked out as per office -- the loading docks are for ancillary use only. It's not going to be a Fed Ex type development. It's total ancillary per the C-P zoning guidelines that are established. So beyond that, that's pretty much the highlights, and I think hopefully answers the questions. And, Ms. Rushing, one thing to note, you can't really see it very well, but there actually is a stormwater pipe coming off of Ponderosa Road right up there that goes underneath the pavement. That's a fire hydrant right there. if you go up a little bit next to that tree, yeah, right there. There is a stormwater pipe that goes off of Ponderosa that will be collecting that and rerouting that as we need to as well. So beyond that, I am happy to answer any questions.

MS. LOE: Any questions for Mr. Hall? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I'm sorry. I had to stand there for a while. My back. If I understand you correctly, Mr. Hall, you are going to attempt to direct almost -- or as much of the stormwater as possible to southeast?

MR. HALL: That is correct. Now -- so basically, if you look at this plan -- and that is one of the reasons why I wanted this brought up. Anything basically from the building forward, for sure, that entire area will be draining to the southeast. In addition to that, I believe our grades are going to allow on the west side where we are at right now, halfway down that 12,000 square-foot building, to also be draining to the south. So the vast majority of it will hit south.

MR. MACMANN: And the roof on this potential structure, do we know?

MR. HALL: It will be a hip roof.

MR. MACMANN: All right.

MR. HALL: But we are --

MR. MACMANN: That's fine.

MR. HALL: -- going to --

MR. MACMANN: Try to carry it.

MR. HALL: Yes, we will carry it through gutters and downspouts because we've got a significant grade difference that we can be able to do that.

MR. MACMANN: I think I speak for several of us up here for sure when I would say that we would be way more comfortable with a ten-foot barrier than a six-foot barrier.

MR. HALL: Yeah. And that's --

MR. MACMANN: Because it's really not --

MR. HALL: -- one of the things -- we're going to be able to do that. I mean, I've seen the plan that's been revised thus far, so --

MS. RUSHING: So will there be curb along that -- what looks like north, but is really --

MR. HALL: Yes. That's right.

MS. RUSHING: -- looks like the -- okay.

MR. HALL: Everything will be curbed so that, you know, you will not have direct runoff off of a -- and it will be able to be collected and retained so to slow the runoff.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? Seeing none. Thank you, Mr. Hall.

MR. HALL: Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight.

MS. LOE: We appreciate your sticking it out.

MR. HALL: Thank my wife.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Any discussion? You're all talked out. I still need someone to frame a motion.

MR. STANTON: You've got to frame a motion right now. As it relates to Case 16-134, Discovery Office Park North C-P major amendment, I recommend to approve -- approval of the major amendment to

the C-P plan and design parameters.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MS. LOE: Motion by Mr. Stanton; second by Ms. Rushing. May we have a roll call -- or a vote.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting yes: Ms. Rushing, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 7-0

MS. BURNS: That is seven votes to approve; zero to deny.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Burns. That concludes the business portion of our agenda.