

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

**JUNE 7, 2018**

**Case No. 18-106**

**A request by Brush & Associates (agent), on behalf of James Harris (owner), seeking approval of a one-lot final plat to be known as "Harris Estates" and a design adjustment from Section 29-5.1(f)(1)(v) of the UDC pertaining to stem lot access. The 10.61-acre parcel is located on the south side of St. Charles Road approximately 700 feet east of Dorado Drive and is comprised of two lots containing 0.61 acres and ten acres. This request is being concurrently reviewed with Case No. 18-104 and Case No. 18-105 which propose rezoning of the 0.61-acre parcel and annexation of the ten-acre parcel. The subject property is currently unimproved.**

MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends:

1. Approval of the design adjustment to Section 29-5.1(f)(1)(v) to allow the creation of a stem lot with less than 30 feet of stem width in a special zoning district; and
2. Approval of the "Harris Subdivision Final Plat" pursuant to minor technical corrections as directed by staff.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Commissioners, questions of staff on the staff? Yes, Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Palmer, I appreciate the creative idea. It sounds wonderful. How do we record that? Where do we keep that information so when those -- either of those properties goes, that's an offer that's out there? I just -- okay. It's a wonderful idea, it's just someone has to know that it's available to them so their planning process may be easier than these folks.

MR. ZENNER: Given that -- given that the adjacent properties rely on this particular stem --

MR. MACMANN: Currently. Right?

MR. ZENNER: -- currently, so back up a little bit, and we haven't covered this in the annexation request because it was not relevant. The information I'm going to provide you will tie into Case 18-104. The planned district property that is to the north of the annexation tract, the roughly ten-acre tract of land, is the former Terebinths PUD for back in the early '90s. It has expired as a development plan for proposed development. And as part of that Terebinths PUD plan, this particular stem lot or this stem was part of the primary driveway network. Development of anything that is left over should Case 18-104, which is the next case, recommend approval of this 0.61-acre tract being rezoned to A, you'll still have the PUD designation on either side of it. And at some point, we're likely going to have action to either take

the old remaining portions of Terebinths out of the PUD designation and put it into the more standard residential subdivision zoning designation and potentially plat or something else, and it is at that point that per the platting standards, if this stem is going to be utilized as access, the stem lot at that point actually, if it's adjoining R-1, the design adjustment you're granting on this future A parcel would not trigger technically the need for the R-1 to have any greater access because that R-1 property, it's not a special district, and all other stem lots outside of our special districts only require a 20-foot stem. So, I think, as Mr. Palmer pointed out, we would seek to obtain the additional five feet, but we may not necessarily be required to obtain it depending on what the adjoining zoning is.

MR. MACMANN: What they -- where they go with it.

MR. ZENNER: Where they go with it.

MR. MACMANN: I'm just -- I'm just trying to find out the -- how are we going to remember and how are they going to know.

MR. ZENNER: The -- as long as our regulations don't change about special districts requiring some additional dedication of right-of-way, that'll always be part of our standard requirements for the adjoining lots that would then come in subsequently for development. The shared private driveway access that the applicant is agreeing to show on this final plat --

MR. MACMANN: That will show on his plat.

MR. ZENNER: That's showing on his plat as part of the recording requirement, so the -- that is affording the adjacent PUD parcels the opportunity to use that access. We would evaluate at a time that the adjoining parcels come in for development, the impact that they create, and potentially the necessity for an upgrade of that shared --

MR. MACMANN: Depending upon zoning?

MR. ZENNER: Depending on their zoning.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: So we can cover all of that at that point. The other thing I want to point out, just so we're clear as to why we are sequencing these projects this particular way, and this, I believe, will be also possibly addressed more fully in the next case, you cannot zone a parcel of property A unless it has two and a half acres. So the recommendation of approval on the annexation request gets us the annexation. The recommendation for approval of this plat combines the two. Should Council or the Commission decide in 18-104 that they do not want to approve a rezoning to A on the 0.61 acres, the plat still can survive with having a split zoning line and they will have their access that they need through a combined and consolidated plat that allows utilities as well as the road access. So that -- that's why this is a little bit out of sequence. One would think you would have handled it numerically, however, as we started to look at how you have to stack the actual applications against each other to ensure that they meet the code requirements, that is why they are in the order that they're in.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Commissioners, any additional questions of staff at this time? I see none. We'll go ahead and open it up to the public, if anyone would like to come forward.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. BRUSH: My name is Dan Brush, offices at 506 Nichols Street. Basically, this would be more than happy to answer any questions you have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Brush. Commissioners, any questions of this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Brush. We'll go ahead and close if nobody else is going to come forward.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, discussion on this case, Case 18-106, or -- yes, Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If there are no questions?

MR. STRODTMAN: I see none.

MR. MACMANN: In the matter of Case 18-106, Harris Estates Final Plat and design adjustment, I move for approval.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacMann, and Mr. Stanton. He had to get his name in there. We have had -- we have received --

MR. MACMANN: -- (inaudible).

MR. STRODTMAN: We have received a motion from Mr. MacMann to accept Case 18-106, it has received a second provided by Mr. Stanton. Is there any discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Loe, whenever you're ready, please, may we have a roll call.

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Case 18-106.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodman, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder. Motion carries 6-0.**

MS. LOE: Six in favor, zero against. Motion carries.