

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

Case Number 155-2025

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of Donna Jean Armstrong 2016 Unitrust (owner) for approval of a seven-lot Preliminary Plat of M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood) zoned property, to be known as "Armstrong Subdivision Plat No. 1". This request is being reviewed concurrently with Case Number 154-2025 which seeks to rezoning the southern 2.56-acres of the overall acreage to M-C (Mixed Use Corridor). The approximately 9.18-acre 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 seven-lot preliminary plat subject to technical corrections regarding requested corner truncations, utility easement illustrations, and other clarifications on the plat.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any member of the Commission has had contact with the party to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Seeing -- Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Not really a question, but I just want to commend staff on these new graphics. It does help visualize things a little better.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anything else? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward, state your name and address for the record, six minutes for the applicant and groups, and three minutes for an individual.

MR. CROCKETT: Again, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 100 West Nifong. Again, I believe the staff did a pretty thorough staff report on this. Again, it is currently zoned M-N, with a pending M-C zoning, so it's been zoned commercial for quite some time. To piggyback on the previous comment, Ms. Geuea Jones, with regards to the access to the other M-C portion, the reason why we didn't take a street all the way through there is you can see that's relatively narrow. If you put a public street through there, it really prohibits what the future development can be. And, more importantly, there is no real place for the street to go at that point. When it goes back out to the public roadway out toward the interchange, MoDOT does not another access, another public street at that location. So they may allow for a private access to have access to that piece of property, but it's certainly not a public street, so that's the reason why it didn't punch all the way through. As staff indicated, we did a traffic study for this. Given the other

intersections in that location, they don't want another full access. The left out was problematic, which we understand, and we're agreeing to limit this to a three-quarter access, and part of that is in conjunction is that we have an access easement with our neighboring property, which is the Schnuck's development that would allow us to have access into their property to get to their full access. So we don't believe a lot of left-turn movements will go out, and if they are needed, then they can certainly go through the other access point further to the east to make that movement. So with that, we're happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. BOUGASH: Don Bougash, 5030 Clark Avenue. Everything I said before. You know, we're - people are concerned about, you know, the developing area and what kind of -- what kind of traffic, what kind of industry is going to be brought into there with children in place, you know. And a lot of the people that came there came there because it was kind of isolated. It didn't have a lot of kids and a lot of -- and kids, when you didn't have a lot of traffic over there and you didn't have a lot of distractions with -- with industry in there. So it's kind of taking away the -- the appeal that The Links and that area at least had for it, so I'm -- you know, I'm not opposed to, you know, growth and that, but I am opposed to putting children at risk. Thank you. Do you have any questions for me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. BOUGASH: You're welcome.

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

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

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

MR. BRODSKY: I'll make a motion, but I do want to acknowledge the public comments that we've had and certainly appreciate that this will represent a change for you, but we do have to take into consideration other folks' property rights and their ability to -- to use their property. So with that, I'll recommend approval of the proposed -- excuse me. Making a motion to recommend approval on Case 155-2025, approve the proposed 9.18-acre seven-lot preliminary plat subject to technical corrections regarding clarifications on labeling the plat.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner Brodsky, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, when you're ready, may we have a roll call?

MR. WILLIAMS: I did have a comment.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, I'm sorry. Please continue.

MR. WILLIAMS: I was swallowing at the moment.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think, you know, these two, the last one and this one are tied together, and I guess it's just a -- you know, there's very few differences between what's permissible and a M-N and M-C, and although we have voted to recommend to City Council for the zoning change, I do hope that what was proposed is what manifests itself because that's roughly in line with -- that is the difference between M-N and M-C, but it's fairly consistent with the uses that are allowed in M-C. There are a few things that are allowed -- or sorry -- in M-N. There's a few things that are allowed in M-C aren't allowed in M-N, that may not be as conducive next to a neighborhood, and so I'm just hopeful that the developers recognize that and that that's how it turns out. Obviously, that's outside of the purview of the Commission once it's in the City Council, once it's approved, but with that, the plot looks fine to me and I understand it would be the same whether we have that as M-N or M-C, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone prepared to make a motion? Oh, sorry.

MR. BRODSKY: -- I --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Did -- that was in discussion. Thank you. I'm sorry. In that case, when you're ready, may we have a roll call?

MR. WILLIAMS: Anyone else wants to discuss? All right.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval). Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky. Voting No: Ms. Placier. Motion carries 7-1.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is seven yeses, one no, the motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.
Moving on to our next case.