



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 6, 2022
7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Columbia City Hall
Council Chambers
701 E. Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. LOE: I will now call the January 6, 2022, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Present.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: Here.

MS. CARROLL: I am here. Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Present.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Here.

MS. CARROLL: I have nine; we have quorum.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

Present: 9 - Tootie Burns, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Anthony Stanton, Michael MacMann, Valerie Carroll, Sharon Geuea Jones, Robbin Kimbell and Peggy Placier

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner, are there any adjustments or additions to the agenda?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, ma'am.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Mr. MacMann, seconded by Mr. Stanton. I'll take a thumbs up approval of the agenda.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: It looks unanimous. Thank you everybody.

Move to approve.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 9, 2021 Regular Meeting

MS. LOE: Everyone should have received a copy of the December 9th meeting minutes. Were there any corrections or changes to those minutes?

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann; seconded by Commissioner Stanton. I'll take a thumbs up approval on those.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: It looks unanimous. Thank you.

Move to approve.

V. TABLING REQUESTS

Case # 43-2022

A request by the Law Firm of Haden and Colbert (agent), on behalf of Columbia's Woodcrest Chapel (owner), to rezone property from A (Agriculture) to M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood) to allow additional commercial use of the property. The approximately 9.56-acre property is located at the northwest corner of Nifong Boulevard and Sinclair Street, and includes the address 2201 W Nifong Boulevard. **(A request to table this item to the February 24, 2022 meeting has been received).**

MS. LOE: Are there any additional comments on this from staff?

MR. SMITH: Nothing substantial. The delay would be -- after discussing it with the applicant to potentially look up some additional data on some of the existing conditions out there before we bring forward a recommendation at the second February meeting. So I -- but I do think the applicant is -- is in the audience.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Depending on where you were going next, I do have my standard question, and it does relate to something Mr. Colbert wrote in his letter, as in if February 2nd [sic] will be enough time.

MS. LOE: Well, I was going to open up the floor to public comment.

MR. MACMANN: All right.

MS. LOE: So perhaps you could ask Mr. Colbert that if he came forward.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you.

MS. LOE: All right. We'll open up the floor to public comment.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

MS. LOE: If you can give your name and address for the record, that would be great.

MR. COLBERT: Sure. Madam Chair, Caleb Colbert, attorney, at 827 East Broadway. We do believe the February 22nd -- or 24th date would give us enough time.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MR. COLBERT: I believe the -- the Sinclair project submitted their traffic study last week, so that should give us plenty of time to get that updated and submitted to the City.

MR. MACMANN: Just in this supplemental report from Woodcrest Chapel, was that enough time for both of those things?

MR. COLBERT: It is.

MR. MACMANN: So you said the 24th, the second meeting in February?

MR. COLBERT: Yes, sir.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I think that -- thank you.

MR. COLBERT: All right. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any additional questions for Mr. Colbert. I see none. Thank you. Any additional speakers on this case? If there aren't, we'll close public comment.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

MS. LOE: Commission comment? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: If my colleagues don't have any additional questions, I would like to entertain a motion. As it relates to Case 43-2022, I would move to accept the table request till the February 24th, 2022 meeting.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Rushing. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Rushing, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll,

Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns. Motion carries 9-0.

MS. CARROLL: We have nine votes to approve. The motion carries.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Recommendation for tabling will be forwarded.

As it relates to Case 43-2022, would move to accept the table request till the February 24th, 2022 meeting.

Yes: 9 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Stanton, MacMann, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Kimbell and Placier

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 25-2022

A request by SSE (agent), on behalf of TS Storage, LLC (owner), for approval of a new PD (Planned Development) Plan to be known as the *TS Storage PD Plan*, a revised statement of intent to add a new permitted use of *Self-service storage facilities*, and design exceptions to Sec. 29-4.1 for reduced side and rear yard setbacks. The 1.79-acre property is located at the northeast corner of Grace Lane and Richland Road. (**This case was tabled at the December 9 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting**)

MS. LOE: May we have a staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends denial of the TS Storage PD Plan and the associated revision to the statement of intent to include a self-service storage facility as a permitted use.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Before we move on to questions for staff, I would 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 same information to consider on behalf of the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Planner Smith, thank you for your in-depth and clear report. When it becomes time, this will be a two-motion thing?

MR. SMITH: I think so. The crux here is you -- you cannot approve the PD Plan without approving the statement of intent because if you don't improve the use, the PD Plan is for a use then that hasn't been approved. I think it's safe to do two motions.

MR. MACMANN: Two motions with the SOI first. Thank you, Planner Smith.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? If there are not, we will open up the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If there is anyone who has any comment to share in this case? Give your name and address for the record.

MR. SIMON: Hello. My name is Keenan Simon, 210 Park Avenue. I'm with SSE, the civil engineer representing the owner for the property.

MR. SMITH: Yes. We -- we do have a PowerPoint the applicant wishes to show.

MR. SIMON: Yeah. Thank you, there. So I think to understand this PD Plan, it's really important to kind of review the storage business model that TS Storage is presenting. You know, the last few years, there's been a surge in recreational equipment. That's RV motor homes, boats, campers. The sales have boomed. There's been a lot of outdoor activities with families and such. And the City of Columbia really has a minimal amount of storage options for indoor storage options here in Columbia. You know, HOAs don't allow boats, RVs to be parked in their driveway, and the City doesn't allow boats, RVs, and motor homes to be parked on the street. So really the target client that TS Storage is going after is owners that are desiring a safe, private, indoor parking option to store their -- their motor home, RV, or boat. In general, they're looking to target a larger motor home for 13 units of the -- of the site, which would house a Class A type motor home. That would be 40 foot in length, 12 foot in height, and that's why we have the height adjustment to the 14-foot limit for those units that are centrally located on that PD Plan. When you start doing the math and you're looking at clearances above a garage, a motor, and a roof, you start to get upwards of -- of a 20-foot height, and that's where that height request was kind of brought in with this. So moving forward -- or exiting, the first thing we did -- the first step we did was reach out to neighborhoods, reach out to the neighbors that were directly adjacent to this property. Being there was a fair amount of Covid going on at the time, we -- we did reach out directly to the owners through phone calls and e-mails. We reviewed our business operations and kind of our model of what we are planning on doing for the site, and then on top of that, we shared site layouts that showed the proposed development that included setbacks, screening, and landscaping that we intended to provide. With this, we kind of developed the PD Plan that we then took to the City. We also included to Clint letters of support from every one of the adjacent property owners to kind of give you an idea of who we spoke with directly and who we had support letters from. The property that is in green is the subject property we're talking about tonight. The home -- the duplexes that are associated in the red were the property owners that we really received letters of support for this project on. So really the development of the PD Plan reflects more of the business model that TS Storage is trying to -- is trying to do here. They're targeting a larger motor home. This requires additional turn radius and more maneuverability through the site. With this, they really felt like the circulation patterns through the site is greatly improved with two access points. It prevents any requirement

for some of the larger vehicles or, you know, a truck towing a boat to have to do any sort of three-point turn, and I'll kind of just pull up the site plan to discuss through this. And then they also increased the width between the RV slips and the -- the boat, camper storage to a greater width to allow for cuing up and backing into the units that are located on the east side of the property, if -- if that kind of makes sense there. Obviously, Clint touched based on the two entrances to the property, more specifically the one there on Richland Road. If you can see with the site plan, the approach is entering the site from one entrance to the other allows you to pull through. There's a garage door intended on both sides of the RV slips so that you would actually be able to pull through that slip and exit without being -- needing the requirement of backing up or creating any sort of turn or possibly hitting anything on the -- on the property there. So the second entrance, it doesn't quite meet the separation requirement the City would like per their standards. I mean, that's obvious. But there's a couple of points I want to make. This entrance is existing, and it's been there since the 1960s. You know, the proposed business use for this property is a very low traffic demand. It's not a convenience store or fast-food restaurant, or one of those types of uses that could back up property leading into the intersection. There's 28 units, as Clint touched base on, so you're not seeing a high traffic flow that could really impact having the second entrance there off Richland. I know the City of Columbia has identified a future round-about at the intersection. You'll note that the two properties south of Richland Road there are kind of cropped off for this future round-about. There's been a few developments that are in the works that are all chipping in 20 to 30 percent chunks of a round-about project that will occur in the next three to seven years at this location. I know that the owners are willing to dedicate a portion of the street easement for this future round-about as long as they're able to maintain this access point onto Richland that's already there. So trying to go over the accommodations for this development for this PD Plan that -- that obviously doesn't quite meet some of the criteria that Clint has pointed out, some of the things we did do was increase the building setback from the street frontage line. We're approximately 65 feet minimum from the street property line to any of our structures. What this does is it increases the landscaping and the green space between our property line and the -- the buildings that are actually on -- onsite. I know -- I think the City minimum landscaping is 15 percent. The site plan that we show actually reflects about 32 percent green space of landscaping. I just rounded it down to 30 percent to show that. I know Clint said 20. I believe the 20-percent number was just in the statement of intent that was originally submitted, not actually what the PD Plan shows there. We also tried to accommodate the future round-about or redesign the site so that we didn't -- so that we reduced the

number of units that we could accomplish on the site to account for the future round-about. We actually did that in consideration for trying to negotiate the entrance onto Richland Road. And then on top of that, we're also trying to provide and enhance architectural finishes and designs for the building. The intent is to create a more residential appearance with the structure so that it fits in with the residential area that it abuts, and providing some design features such as steps in the -- step backs in the facade to kind of break it up and make it look less commercial in the grand scheme of things. So this is just kind of another shot from the other angle that kind of shows this stepped facade to kind of enhance that design element. Once again, these units that are at the central portion of the site that do have the additional height are strictly just for the RV slips to be able to fit a Class A motor home in. The units that are on the east side of the site do maintain -- do not exceed that 14-foot height, just to kind of clarify the difference between those and kind of where they're located at on the site.

MS. LOE: Thank you. We are over our six-minute time limit. Were there concluding -- or do you want to wrap up comments?

MR. SIMON: Yeah, I know. I think that's where I'm at right here. Just wanted to, you know, touch base and summarize, and look for support for this PD Plan. You know, we're providing architectural design aspects that are going to help make it look -- reduce the commercial look, you know, we increased the landscaping and green space at the street frontage and provided more trees and such. We also provided a setback for the future round-about. We're asking to maintain that access onto Richland for circulation of our site. And, you know, the neighbors supported this project that are directly adjacent to us. This shows, you know, acceptance of this project in the community, and we ask for you guys to approve this.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions? I'm going to go down the line. Ms. -- Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yes. I -- I have -- I don't -- it's not so much a question as it is a comment, because you talked about neighbor support. We just received some communication from someone in the neighborhood that is not supportive. The correspondence included it in our packet that was supportive appeared to be a boilerplate. Literally, word for word statements with different names affixed. There was something inauthentic about that. I don't know if that boilerplate was provided by your company or by the owner, but it -- it did not impress me as genuine neighborhood input. Now, the -- I assume you've got the letter from Teresa Long.

MR. SIMON: Yeah, I know. I just kind of read through it. It looks as if she's -- she believes that this is going to be an open lot for storage, similar to the lot across from

James Fencing where materials are just placed in the open. That's -- that's not the intent. There is no open storage allowed on this -- on this property.

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I think that was her -- her fear that that might happen.

MR. SIMON: Correct. Yeah.

MS. PLACIER: But in general, it looks like you're trying to shoehorn something that needs a larger space, especially the -- the limitation of the space between this, the reduction of the space between this and the neighboring houses, which are really very close. It is troubling.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Similarly, I -- I agree you've got property owner sign-off, but it looks like we've got 11 duplexes and four letters, so I'm wondering if you talked to any of the actual residents?

MR. SIMON: No. I talked to the owners of the property.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you talked to no residents?

MR. SIMON: That's correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. That was my only question. Thank you.

MR. SIMON: Yeah.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Hi, Keenan. I had a couple of questions. I agree with you about the need. My parents own one of these buses, as I call them.

MR. SIMON: Yeah. That's -- yeah.

MR. MACMANN: I don't mind the need. I do agree with the previous statement about a little bit of shoehorning. And I don't really have a problem with the 22 feet. I know there's -- working construction, my parents own one of these things, you need a lot of space. I do have problem, number one, with the Richland Road exit. We're already looking -- for those of us who live on the west side, some other areas of Columbia, we're already looking at exits. And I agree, this -- you have a three point for those giant things to turn around. You don't want backing up. I get that.

MR. SIMON: Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: The concept of a busy road of a 40-foot bus or a tandem rig pulling out there very close to the intersection I think is very problematic. The ten to twenty feet, we have to think about or twenty to ten feet, we have to think about ownership going into the future. And it was probably going to be fine with the owners of the duplexes. They don't care; they don't live there. I have concern about that, and I appreciate you need a big footprint to do what you're doing. As the previous comment would be you might --

your space might be a little bit small.

MS. LOE: Other questions? Commissioner Rushing?

MS. CARROLL: Will this site be attended?

MR. SIMON: There is not actually intended to be an office there or anything of that nature. It is more of a -- you know, I guess, an app that allows you access to the units and stuff. The intent was never to have any sort of hard fencing at the frontage or the boundary of the property, but there's more -- more or less access units for your -- your slip, essentially, keypads of that nature that would in and out of that -- of that unit.

MS. CARROLL: I understand that you intend for this to be used for RVs and boats and such. I'm wondering if there's any mechanism to ensure that that intent is what occurs. It seems like someone could rent a storage unit and use it for whatever they wanted.

MR. SIMON: Yes. And that's kind of where we had -- it's kind of a unique circumstance as far as what zoning category it fits into, and that's why we had to go with the self-storage portion for the use group of this is because, yes, we can monitor who is, you know, in there, and we can look at -- we could potentially do checks on -- on what's being stored there to make sure someone is not living -- but you are right. It's not to say that someone couldn't -- couldn't try to do something that isn't in line with the -- with the use that's intended.

MS. CARROLL: But I'm not sure. Would you be able to forbid someone from renting one of these to store building materials or anything? I mean, I'm not sure if that's --

MR. SIMON: I think you -- I think the price point that's intended for indoor storage for these RV units would greatly exceed the cost of someone storing material use. I'll just be honest with you. You're looking a monthly rental rate of \$700-\$800. They -- they can go to a very low end, cheap storage unit outside of town, and they could rent ten, fifteen units for that price. I'm just -- I'm just being honest. The clientele that they're trying to target is -- is able to afford more of a higher end rental for a big toy. I'm just -- that's what -- that's the target for this -- this facility, quite honestly.

MS. CARROLL: I see. Thanks.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: The units in the middle for the RVs, are those drive-through?

MR. SIMON: That is correct. They will have a garage door on -- on each side. You'll see that there's kind of a bump-out that represents each slip for the unit.

MS. RUSHING: So the two entrances or exits are really necessary for those particular vehicles?

MR. SIMON: It really simplifies the maneuverability through the site. It's not to say

that someone couldn't pull through coming off of Grace and then they would most likely have to maneuver a two- or three-point turn after they've exited their slip to go back out on Grace. So correct. The intent was to try and make it as less cumbersome and for new drivers and owners to be able to maneuver through the site without concern or apprehension about hitting something.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just to reiterate the statement Mr. Simon made, having stored things on -- construction stuff and lease spaces for that, this is way out of the league. You don't -- you're not going to spend that kind of money. There's nothing to prevent something -- someone who is willing to spend that kind of money from doing something we would rather they not do, but they could do it much more cheaply somewhere else. And to Mr. Simon's other point, I said my parents have one of these things, they're not easy to drive. And you're talking about people who don't drive stuff of this size normally. A two- or three-point backing up turn, I'm just -- while I am being supportive of Mr. Simon in this case, you might tell from my earlier comments where I'm going to end up with this though. I just wanted to make those points. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry. Just one more clarification. You keep referring to the existing drive on Richland.

MR. SIMON: Correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That looks to me to be a residential access that just happens to begin where you want your driveway to be, but, right now, that goes sort of onto your property, but it's clearly being used by the residents. It is not a driveway, per se. It looks like it's a gravel access that people have kind of made a driveway.

MR. SIMON: It looks to me like a driveway. I mean, it's --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, but it's -- it's not the same thing that you're trying to do.

MR. SIMON: I mean, all I'm simply stating as a fact is that entrance has been there since, you know, the '60s -- the late '60s.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right.

MR. SIMON: And we'd like to maintain that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But it's not a curbed entrance that is being used for commercial purposes?

MR. SIMON: You're correct. It's not an improved entrance.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. SIMON: I mean, there's a lot of entrances off of Richland that are not curbed. You know, the site is not developed.

MS. LOE: Mr. Smith, can you go back to the property plan, please?

MR. SMITH: Excuse me. Which slide?

MS. LOE: The site -- that -- there. The report we received identified that the request for a reduction in the side yard setbacks was necessary to ensure proper maneuverability on the site for the larger vehicles. Was that a correct assessment?

MR. SIMON: That was -- I mean, that was the intent. It's funny you would mention this because we had -- we kind of looked at this site and -- and if there was an option to provide that 20-foot setback, we could possibly reduce some of the green space that we are accounting at the frontage of the property to shift everything ten feet. Bu Clint thought that that would not be sufficient for -- for noting or reviewing or changing at this time, kind of was where we're at. That would be something we could -- we would be willing to -- I don't know what the next step would be, but we would be willing to consider --

MS. LOE: I -- I guess I was also curious why the parking -- four parking stalls are also located within the maneuverability space. And if those were -- parking stalls are typically at least eight feet wide, so if those are relocated, we could gain at least 18 feet on the long side. So can the parking go somewhere else?

MR. SIMON: Yes. The parking could go somewhere else.

MS. LOE: All right. Any additional questions for this speaker? Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: Where the parking is on that side over there, is that -- that would be for RVs uncovered, or what is the parking for?

MR. SIMON: Well, it's -- no. There's a -- for self-storage standards, you're required to provide onsite parking.

MS. KIMBELL: Okay.

MR. SIMON: I know it's kind of silly because, well, all the parking is in buildings, but it's -- it's a requirement that is in the new UDC, so we provided that.

MS. LOE: No. Because I have family that have RVs, and if you want to go visit your RV to do any maintenance or cleaning or stocking before a trip, you need to park your car somewhere on the site when you go into the RV.

MR. SIMON: Yeah.

MS. LOE: And that's what these stalls are for.

MR. SIMON: Correct. No. You are correct.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: As far as security issues, what is being done to keep that area safe?

MR. SIMON: Yeah. I mean, the intent would be to provide standard lighting high cutoff so that it doesn't bleed into the residential district. But from the security

standpoint, they have video cameras that are set up throughout the site that monitor the site. As far as -- they're trying not to -- the intent is not to create a gated community or a gated storage area that has an industrial look. That's why they're trying to increase the green space and provide more of an open site. The units are locked. They have a new Blue Tooth that a -- digital lock that's programmable and resettable by the person that is renting out the slip, and it can be changed, you know, onsite, if there is -- if someone would need to get into it for an emergency situation, police, ambulance, or something of that nature, so that is the development intent that they have for that, if that makes sense.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? I see none at this time. Thank you. If there are no additional speakers on this case, we'll close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission comment? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If none of my fellow Commissioners have any comments, this will - there will be two motions here, one for the statement of intent, one for the PD Plan. Firstly, in the matter of the revision to the statement of intent on Case Number 25-2022 -- thank you, Mr. Smith -- I move to approve -- I've made my motion in the affirmative. I will be voting no.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. We have a motion on the floor for the PD Plan.

MR. ZENNER: Statement of Intent, first.

MS. LOE: Or, sorry. Statement of intent. That was for my clarification, as much as everyone else's.

MS. RUSHING: I was going to ask.

MS. LOE: Any discussion on this motion? Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: I will be very brief. I just want to point out, so that it's on the record somewhere, that this is an 18-and-a-half-year-old PD plan statement of intent that clearly has to be amended, but under my -- I really prefer straight zoning whenever possible so that things don't sit there for 18 and a half years on an empty lot. I just want to say that in a place that will be transcribed. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Duly noted. Any additional comments? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton. Voting No: Ms. Rushing, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Ms. Burns. Motion denied 8-1.

MS. CARROLL: We have eight no votes, and one yes. The motion carries,

MS. LOE: It's denied.

MS. CARROLL: I mean, the motion is denied. Sorry. That was --

MR. MACMANN: Democracy in action there.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Very serendipitous on this day of all days. If there are no other current questions, I have another motion. In the matter of the TS Storage Plan PD Plan, Case 25-2022, I move to approve. Again, I'm making that motion in the affirmative. I plan to vote no.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Second motion on the floor. This one for the PD Plan. Any discussion on this motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton. Voting No: Ms. Rushing, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Commissioner Loe, Ms. Burns. Motion denied 8-1.

MS. CARROLL: We have eight no votes, one yes. This motion is denied.

MS. LOE: Recommendations will be forwarded to City Council. That concludes our cases for the evening.

Motion #1 - In the matter of the revision to the statement of intent on Case Number 25-2022 move to approve VOTING YES: Stanton VOTING NO: Rushing, MacMann, Geuea Jones, Placier. Kimbell, Carroll, Loe, Burns. Motion denied 8-1.

Motion #2 - In the matter of the TS Storage Plan PD Plan, Case 25-2022, move to approve. VOTING YES: Stanton VOTING NO: Rushing, MacMann, Geuea Jones, Placier. Kimbell, Carroll, Loe, Burns. Motion denied 8-1.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Are there any additional public comments?

VIII. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. LOE: If there aren't, are there any staff comments?

MR. ZENNER: Your next meeting will be on January 20th. We will have a regular work session at 5:30 p.m. and, very likely, a very short January 20th meeting as we are anticipating the following two items that are currently advertised and scheduled for this meeting to be requested to be tabled. But because they have been advertised, we are required to conduct the public hearing associated with them in case there are residents of the adjoining properties wanting to address the issue. So there will be a -- most likely a staff -- there will be staff reports prepared and there will be a meeting; however, it will be short. These particular requests are both of the same property. One is a conditional use

permit, and the other rezoning request from AG to M-C. The conditional-use permit is to permit a recreational vehicle travel trailer park on the subject site, which is here shown on the map. It is currently zoned AG. They are requesting to have the property rezoned to M-C. This is two parcels of property at this point, principally accessed off of Paris Road, although it does have the appendage on the very southern portion of the property to get you to Hinkson Creek Road, but you would have to cross the creek to get there. The improvements that are immediately to the west are Tractor Supply and Koonse Glass immediately across the street to the west on Paris Road. You will notice the maps are slightly different, and this will be a -- a problem for a while. We had a catastrophic loss of information related to our mapping software, and we are back to generating maps the old-fashioned way, so we are slowly, but surely adapting to this, and some of the information that you saw this evening on your aerial photography, such as adjoining zoning and some other things, we're trying to clean up at this point to bring it back to life, so bear with us. You will have your regular set of maps though within your packets, locator -- aerial locator, your utility map, and your topo map, they're just going to look a little bit different for the short term. We hope to have the previous mapping software back in shape by the end of, hopefully, this month at the earliest. Those are your two items. As I said, they will likely be tabled. If they're not, it could be an interesting discussion during the 20th's meeting, but we believe at this point, given we haven't received first-round comments back, and there are some other questions that need to be answered, I will have a tabling request sometime next week before we produce the packet. So look for that. As we discussed this evening in work session, we will continue to move forward with discussion of our short-term rental regulations with shelling out the first tier of potential STR standards, along with definitions for your consideration to which we can then start to put the framework together for our actual regulatory structure that we would utilize in the future. With that, that's all we have to offer this evening. Thank you very much. Hopefully, you enjoyed your break. It will be short-lived because the February 10th meeting is quite extensive, so what we can move through or move to a future agenda, like the 24th, will be beneficial.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. Similar to Commissioner Geuea Jones, I wanted to put something on the record while it's still fresh, and that is about annexation and relationship between annexation and the proposals that we see. At the December 20th City Council meeting, which I attended, the Council took up Hardy Plat I on Route KK. And as noted

by Councilperson Pitzer, this was a very strange and troubling request. If you remember, it was this U-shaped or thing surrounding someone's home and it was very strange, and there was puzzlement all around, and it looked like it was coming from P & Z, and we had approved this strange thing, which we had not. We did not approve the annexation of that horseshoe. Council approved it at some time in the past, and it was all I could do to restrain myself from popping up and saying we had nothing to do with this. And as weird as that was, in this case, annexation at least preceded the proposal because we have also had the simultaneous request upon annexation, while we are obligated after annexation to assign a land use, to assign a zoning. Then it is our duty. But there is an assumption of annexation, it goes on the consent agenda, it's thoughtlessly approved, and that's how we get Hardy Plat I. So it's not good City planning, and it's making the boundaries of the City look like one of those impossible jigsaw puzzles that you see, and that I would never buy because I could never possibly work it. So I want to encourage us to keep bringing this forward to urge the Council to be more careful about annexation requests, and not to complete annexation with our decisions on P & Z, and, just for the record, that's my statement.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Commissioner Placier. Commissioner MacMann, and then Commissioner Carroll.

MR. MACMANN: Oh, just -- just real quick to Commissioner Placier's thing. As you know, I attend many of these meetings, and had I caught that, it was already -- I tried to clarify that on the record for them. You can see them looking sideways sometimes, but we did not do that.

MS. PLACIER: Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: Or maybe afterwards individually or something. I had another motion, but I think Mr. --

MS. LOE: I think Commissioner Carroll just had a follow-up comment.

MS. CARROLL: Yeah, if I may. Issues surrounding annexation and whose purview the decision is, or at least the initial vote is, have come up quite a bit over the past two years and perhaps before that, too, but it came to my attention within the past two years. And I've been trying to make it as clear as possible whenever we have an annexation case with zoning attached to it before us, that this body only votes on zoning. We don't vote on annexation. We don't review annexation. And it's for that reason that the last two times that it came before us, I asked to pull the associated annexation off the consent agenda once they're linked. So what's happening is that a zoning assignment comes before us and that's what we vote on, only Council votes and reviews the annexation. We vote on it pending annexation, should Council approve. And then after our vote, it has to

get put onto the agenda, so they're being linked at that point and then put on the agenda. So that -- that is the strategy that I observed to be the most clear about what we are able to vote on and what we are not.

MS. LOE: So based on the comments you've both made, it's clear Council does not understand this process and who is approving what. So I commend the efforts to provide clarification. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a comment, and then I have that final motion. There will be at least one, if not two or three new Councilpersons. Prior to the election, City staff actually sits down with them, the prospective candidates, and they're given a briefing. There may be a little more focus that could go in, like, in duties and things like that. I'll pass that along, also.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE - January 20, 2022 @ 7 pm (tentative)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners have no other comments or concerns at this time, I move to adjourn.

MS. PLACIER: Second.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: I'm going to give that to Commissioner Placier -- the second. We are adjourned. Thanks everybody. Good to see you all. Happy New Year.

(Off the record)

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:11 p.m.)

Move to adjourn