

**MINUTES**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**APRIL 7, 2022**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

**Ms. Sara Loe**  
**Ms. Valerie Carroll**  
**Ms. Tootie Burns**  
**Ms. Peggy Placier**  
**Mr. Michael MacMann**  
**Ms. Joy Rushing**  
**Mr. Anthony Stanton**  
**Ms. Sharon Geuea Jones**  
**Ms. Robbin Kimbell**

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

**STAFF PRESENT**

**Mr. Pat Zenner**  
**Mr. Rusty Palmer**  
**Ms. Rebecca Thompson**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

MS. LOE: I'm going to call the April 7th Planning and Zoning Meeting to order.

**II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MS LOE: Are there any adjustments, additions to the agenda?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, there are, ma'am. Case number 109-22, which you have a handout in front of you at your seats, there is a request to table that case, so that will be handled after the approval of the minutes.

MS. LOE: Thank you for pointing that out. Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Move to approve the agenda.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner Geuea Jones, seconded by Commissioner Mr. MacMann. I'll take a thumbs-up approval on the agenda.

(Eight votes for approval; one abstention)

MS. LOE: We have eight for and one abstention.

**III. INTRODUCTIONS**

MS. LOE: Everyone should have received a copy of the March -- oh, I'm sorry. Call to order.

MS. GEUEA JONES: This is what happens when you don't have our computers ready, Pat.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. 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: Commissioner Rushing?

MS. RUSHING? Here.

[Mr. MacMann was present but was not named during roll call.]

MS. CARROLL: We have nine; we have a quorum.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Commissioner Carroll.

#### **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MS. LOE: All right. We've done the agenda. Minutes. Everyone should have received a copy of the March 24th, 2022 regular meeting minutes. Were there any additions, changes to those meeting minutes?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Move to approve.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner Geuea Jones, seconded by Commissioner MacMann. I'll take a thumbs up approval on the minutes.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: Unanimous. Thank you.

#### **V. TABLING REQUEST**

MS. LOE: All right. That brings us to our first business of the evening, which is tabling.

#### **Case 109-2022**

**A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Lyon Crest Properties, LLC (owners), is seeking approval of a major amendment to the "Cotswold Villas at Bluff Creek Estates" PD Plan and a design adjustment to Section 29-5.1 of the UDC relating to development access. The proposed revision will rename the existing PD Plan to "PD Planned Development of Bluff Creek Estates, Plat No. 8" and includes proposed revisions that modify the previously approved lot arrangement and internal roadway network. The proposed revision contains a total**

**of 39 single-family lots and is consistent with the prior plan approval.**

MS. LOE: This was a publicly advertised case, so any staff comments on the tabling?

MR. ZENNER: The tabling request is -- been asked for by Lyon Crest, LLC. They are the owners of the property. It has been submitted such that they may be able to have interaction with the adjoining neighborhood association to engage and address particular concerns that have been expressed, which were provided to you through public correspondence earlier this week. The request for the extended tabling to June 9 is due to some previously scheduled time away from town, and therefore, that best meets their schedule to be able to be back and present for the Planning Commission's consideration. Staff does not object to the requested tabling. We will re-advertise given that the initial public hearing date to the table date is greater than two months, so pursuant to our procedural requirements, we will re-advertise in the paper. Property owners will be notified of the updated public hearing date. And there will also, depending on the outcome of the meeting with the adjoining neighborhood association, may be revisions to the currently published Planning and Zoning Commission report that will reflect updates based upon any discussion and modifications that the applicant is desiring to make based on the communication that they are going to engage in. So with that, we would make a recommendation that the tabling request be approved. As you pointed out, this was an advertising public hearing, and if there are individuals of the public that have come down to City Hall this evening, they are more than welcome to approach. However, we are not prepared to make a presentation as it relates to the content of the staff report, and the discussion would generally be limited to the tabling request or not.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Any questions of staff before we open up the public hearing? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick. Thank you, Madam Chair. We might have to table this again, is what it sounds like, if there's a lot of back and forth. Or do we -- we don't really know that if we have changes.

MR. ZENNER: At this point, we are -- we are aware of a couple of modifications to the Statement of Intent, which is basically a carry forward from the 2016 Statement of Intent. We are unaware of any additional plan revisions. However, given that this is a month and -- a month between this hearing -- a little bit over a month between this hearing and the proposed scheduled public hearing, I don't believe that there will be any delay. The review of this project was completed, and the project was being recommended for approval along with the design adjustment, so there are no technical issues with the plat. I can't imagine that the changes that would be made, if they are -- other than the Statement of Intent, I don't see major changes possibly in the site plan that would require full re-review, which would then result in an additional delay.

MR. MACMANN: My concern was if you're going to meet with the neighbors again, we just don't know what's going on there. That said, thank you, Mr. Zenner.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open up the floor to public

comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. LOE: If anyone is here to provide public comment, it would just be on the tabling tonight. Seeing none, we will close public comment on this case.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. LOE: Commission comment? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Having -- seeing no other comments or concerns, I have a motion. In the matter of Case 109-2022, request by Crockett Engineering on behalf of Lyon Crest LLC, request to table, I move to approve.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Mr. MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Geuea Jones. 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. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Ms. Rushing, Mr. MacMann. Motion carries 9-0.**

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

MS. LOE: Thank you, Commissioner Carroll. Recommendation for tabling is supported.

**VI. SUBDIVISIONS**

MS. LOE: That brings us to our subdivisions for the evening.

**Case Number 111-2022**

**A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Green Meadows Property, LLC (owners), for approval of a three-lot final plat to be known as *Quail Creek West Plat 7*. The 0.81-acre parcel is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Smith Drive and Louisville Drive.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested final minor plat subject to minor technical corrections.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Before we move on to questions for staff, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte related to this case to please share that with the Commission at this time so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? No questions. With that, we will open up the floor to public comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. LOE: If anyone does have any public comment on this case, you are invited to come forward. We would need your name and address for the record. I see none. We will close public comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. LOE: Commissioner comment? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: As long as my fellow Commissioners have no comments or concerns, I have a motion.

MS. LOE: I have a --

MR. PALMER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. LOE: -- question, I guess. This is actually -- it is a question for staff. Mr. Palmer, so I was curious with regard to -- this is the only north-south connector west of -- major north-south connector at this location for -- and I don't have the map pulled up to me. But there's no other through street east of this for some distance. Which is the next one that goes through?

MR. PALMER: Well, the next one that immediately comes to mind is Scott. You're west of Scott Boulevard here. I believe that's --

MS. LOE: Yeah. I don't think there's one between Scott and -- and Louisville --

MR. PALMER: Right. I don't think -- I don't think that's --

MS. LOE: And given the topography, this is the only other connector, so it is a collector --

MR. PALMER: Yes.

MS. LOE: -- as you say. So -- and as you point out, there's the requirement that private residential driveways are prohibited on collector streets, and that this has been given the alternative. I was interested in the next item, which only applies to non-residential driveways, but it raises the issue of distance of driveways from intersections, because these driveways are starting to get pretty close to an intersection of two major collectors. So I looked up the Missouri Department of Transportation Access Management Guidelines, and these three driveways are well within that distance back that they required. Was -- does staff have any comment on that?

MR. PALMER: There is a note on the plat pertaining to the southern lot, and I forget exactly the genesis of that, but it -- the southern lot would be limited to the southern 40 feet, I believe of the -- of the lot. Is -- yeah. Right. Right. Right. It's the northern lot cannot be outside of the southern 40 feet of the lot. So it would have to be, you know, whatever the distance there is, so it would have to be in southwest corner of lot 103 or whatever the northern lot there.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. So the genesis of the -- the genesis of the comment was after consultation with the City's traffic engineer and Mr. Teddy and his authority, given that there -- in Mr. Teddy's opinion, there was no other alternative to provide reasonable access to these lots, other than what was along Louisville, the traffic engineer, in application of the standards that you're referring to, which we have not adopted as the City's access management requirements, determined that a driveway no closer than the southern 40 feet of the property of Lot 10 -- or 703 was acceptable and would meet our general requirements based on the anticipated traffic flow. That was -- there was a long, arduous conversation about these lots even being able to be created in this configuration. So to assure you that

there was -- this was just not glossed over, and there was contemplation as to where the driveways needed to go, did the driveways need to be shared, and we've -- we did an analysis of the number of driveways that are on this road that are inside the City, those that are in the county, and our -- our staff, the traffic engineer, and Mr. Teddy concluded after that analysis that what these three lots with the restriction on the northernmost lot closest to the intersection was the best situation possible for each lot to have their own individual access, given shared driveways create their own set of unique challenges for detached residential housing.

MS. LOE: Also when I considered if there could be a shared -- I mean, I was looking at if the two southern lots were reoriented north-south, and you did a shared driveway for all three, that would place the shared driveway as the one closest to the intersection, and I wasn't sure how much we would be gaining with that. But thank you, Mr. Zenner. Mr. MacMann. Sorry. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you very much. Just real quick. Mr. Zenner, there is no street parking on Louisville, is there?

MR. ZENNER: To my recollection, I don't believe there -- I don't -- on a collector, we typically would only allow you to do street parking -- we would allow you to park on both sides. I believe there is no parking in -- I believe there are no parking signs actually in front of the park.

MR. MACMANN: That would be -- thank you, Mr. Zenner. Madam Chair, to your point, because we -- we actually went through this when we were talking about the -- the other developments in the Code. Thank you for the catch, by the way, because I didn't think about the distance. I would be comfortable with this if there was no parking along the front of those lots, because this is -- I used to spend a lot of time over there. Half, two-thirds of the day, there is no traffic, and then it's really busy, particularly Smith. Mr. Zenner or Ms. Thompson, could we add the stipulation that there be no parking in front of these lots in case there -- it's allowed currently? Ms. Thompson has a pained look on her face.

MR. ZENNER: I would have to -- I think we can communicate the desire with the traffic engineers --

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. Well, it's just a matter of putting the signage up?

MR. ZENNER: That's -- and that's where I was going with my -- with my hesitated comment. This is a 38-foot curb and gutter street. This is the old model of collectors, which allowed parking on both sides.

MR. MACMANN: And I think it's -- it's fine right now, but when Breckenridge is fully built out, or it's built out further to the west or we cross the creek, then we have a whole different -- different environment.

MR. ZENNER: Kind of environment.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: I -- I think we can -- to condition the approval of this plat on that, which is really a traffic -- a traffic-engineering issue more so, I would not advise that. I think what we can do is take the

comment and the recommendation that the Commission --

MR. MACMANN: To Mr. Stone?

MR. ZENNER: -- to Mr. Stone and ask that they evaluate that at this point. I -- given the intersection and as Ms. Loe has pointed out, as we come to the intersection of Smith, we are going to want to assure that we do not have vehicles stacked up to the intersection. And with that in mind, I'm not quite sure that that actually is probably not already in that contemplated --

MR. MACMANN: Okay. If you could pass that along to streets to roads, that would be awesome, and I will keep that out and -- and trust where Mr. -- Mr. Stone is the -- heads -- the head of that department -- trust that Mr. Stone will do his job dutifully. Madam Chair, if we have no more questions. In the matter of Case -- what am I looking -- oh -- 111-2022, final plat for Quail Creek West Plat 7, I move to approve --

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. MACMANN: -- with the following -- I'm sorry, Mr. Stanton. I apologize. -- with the addition of technical comments by the surveyor and the attachment of the clarifying note regarding lot access, the approval by Mr. Teddy, I move to approve. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Second.

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

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Ms. Rushing, Mr. MacMann. Motion carries 9-0.**

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

MS. LOE: Thank you. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. That brings us to our second subdivision case for the evening.

#### **Case Number 116-2022**

**A request by Luebbert Engineering (agent), on behalf of D&D Investment of Columbia, LLC (owners), for a revised preliminary plat, on their property located near the intersection of Lake of the Woods and Geyser Boulevard, to be known as "Forest Hills Plat 3." Revisions include a modified street layout and additional lots at the southeast corner of the parcel, further subdividing Lot 94 of the approved preliminary plat, "Forest Hills, Plat No. 1."**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat, Forest Hills Plat 3, subject to minor technical corrections.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Before we move on to questions of staff, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte related to this case to please share that with the

Commission at this time so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Thanks, Rusty. I thought that we weren't doing cul-de-sacs anymore. I thought that the fire department had preferred hammerhead turnarounds to cul-de-sacs.

MR. PALMER: The standard is still a cul-de-sac. We -- we have had a number of hammerhead options used lately because -- partially because of an increased diameter needed in those cul-de-sac bulbs.

MS. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. PALMER: But, yeah. The standard is actually still the cul-de-sac.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. So this has enough diameter --

MR. PALMER: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: -- in that case, so you would stick with that if there's -- okay.

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Commissioner Carroll, because that was one of the two of the questions I was going to ask. Mr. Palmer, could I see the oblique aerial again, please? Just a technical question, and I'm sure we've done it. The common lot set aside for the wetlands and drainage areas encompasses all of those areas? There's none of that running into occupied lots, or lots that will be --

MR. PALMER: No. It's all encompassed by the -- by the common lot.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions of staff? Seeing none. We will open up the floor to public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. LOE: Please give your name and address for the record.

MS. LUEBBERT: My name is Christina Luebbert, 304 Travis Court in Jefferson City. I represent the -- the developers. And one really minor comment about the -- you asked about the cul-de-sacs. Because of the limitations of the room based on some of the original design back in the early 2000s, a larger diameter was actually not feasible, so -- but those cul-de-sacs are within the short distance that's allowed for you to be able to back a fire truck back onto an adjacent street. So we -- we're, like, right at the limit on the Royal Plum Court, and we have plenty of room down by Apple Blossom because that's just barely a bulb. It -- the cul-de-sac length is very short, so we're -- we're allowed to do that without going to the ginormous 96 diameter cul-de-sac bulb. So while they are bulbs, they are not technically fire turn-around bulbs, and then -- and, yes, the -- the wetland is completely contained within the common lot that will be transferred to the homeowners' association eventually, or much like the existing common lots that are along the stream area.

MS. LOE: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Did you all get any feedback from any surrounding property owners? I know that you're kind of far from anybody right there.

MS. LUEBBERT: We have not on this phase.

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MS. LUEBBERT: We had some very testy neighbors on the previous phase, and we worked through to come up with a design that -- that was acceptable to all parties.

MR. MACMANN: That's one of the reasons I was asking the question, because I didn't see anything. I was, like, did you talk to them, and what did they say?

MS. LUEBBERT: The property to the south is currently vacant.

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MS. LUEBBERT: They haven't -- you know, the owners have not been contacted --

MR. MACMANN: No comments, no input?

MS. LUEBBERT: -- because they are not local. And we have -- I have assembled a street name request or street name change request package, but we had to get one signature from the one existing house that's on Royal Plumb. There's only one house that has that address, and we have to get their signature so that we can avoid a public hearing on that, so we're getting in touch with them to get that -- those name changes, because we can't technically do that through the platting process, we have to go through a different process to change the street names.

MR. MACMANN: Right.

MS. LUEBBERT: So we've started that process, as well.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. I just was checking on where the neighbors were at.

MS. LUEBBERT: Yes.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Hi. Thanks for coming in.

MS. LUEBBERT: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You've got several common lots for bio retention, which I appreciate because it can be a huge problem. My -- my question is, because we had a case not too long ago where a developer was not sensitive to the development phase of what happens with those lots, so I just want to know if you're thinking ahead about that. The issue there was during construction everything basically had to be clear cut, all of the greenery gone, so then the runoff wasn't staying in those common lots, and the -- the developer hadn't yet turned them over. So my -- what are you going to do to manage the runoff, not after you're done building, but while you're doing that?

MS. LUEBBERT: We're -- we're required by both city and state law to do proper erosion and sediment control, so that will be part of our infrastructure plans when we bring the final plat forward. Some of those -- phasing is always a little tricky, and -- and we'll do what we can. We're already required

under our current 404 permit for the entire subdivision to protect the wetland, so it's -- it's been protected through this whole process because there used to be a farm pond above it that we were allowed to drain in an earlier phase. So we're -- we already have to do some things there. These are -- while they are -- this is a very rolling topography area, which is part of why I have detention basins in, like, six different locations because it was -- there was no way to get all the water to go to one place.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right.

MS. LUEBBERT: And so we're -- we're going to be -- none of the drainage areas are particularly large, though, which makes it a little bit easier to manage. So we will just be working with our contractor, which is, for the previous two phases, has been Emery Sapp & Sons, and they're very responsive to -- to taking care of the erosion and sediment control and storm-water control for us.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would it be correct then to say because the wetland is protected, you can't remove the topsoil from that area while you're building.

MS. LUEBBERT: We can't touch -- we can't do anything in that area. We can't touch it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right. And are you going to be removing topsoil in the other bio-retention areas? Is that -- do you know yet? You may not know yet, but --

MS. LUEBBERT: I think because of the way that will have to be graded -- because we also are getting detention storage above our bio retention. I think the size of the berms will end up -- the grading will necessitate the removal of topsoil initially.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. But the wetland is protected?

MS. LUEBBERT: Wetland we can't touch at all.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can't touch, not going to be a problem?

MS. LUEBBERT: It will not -- equipment cannot go in that area.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Wonderful. Thank you. I just wanted to get that on the record.

MS. LUEBBERT: No problem. Happy to clarify.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MS. LUEBBERT: And any other questions, of course.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you.

MS. LUEBBERT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none, we will close public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. LOE: Commission comment? Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: If no one else has any comments, I'll make a motion. In the matter of Case Number 116-2022, I recommend approval of the Forest Hills Plat 3 preliminary plat pursuant to minor technical corrections with comments by the Planning and Law Department.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner Geuea Jones, 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. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Ms. Rushing, Mr. MacMann. Motion carries 9-0.**

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

MS. LOE: Thank you. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. That concludes our hearings for the evening.

#### **VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

MS. LOE: Any additional public comment? If there is none, we will move on.

#### **VIII. STAFF COMMENTS**

MS. LOE: Any staff comments?

MR. ZENNER: Should you ever be in suspense that there aren't? Your next meeting is Thursday, April 21st, and it will be a slightly longer agenda. Not much, but just slightly. The cases for that meeting consist of two. We have, as Mr. Palmer pointed out, a preliminary plat across the street from the one that we just approved this evening on the larger parcel that had the lake. This would be on the southwest side of Louisville and Smith. It is for a four-lot development preliminary plat. And then you will have a public hearing for 511 Rollins Road. This is a request to go from R-MF to PD with a plan, and this is actually an existing sorority house that has previously sought Board of Adjustment approval for a series of zoning variances which were denied. And so the next course of relief for the applicant would be to come before this body as a planned zoning district and seek similar relief through the planned district process. So this is going to be a -- a new one, I think, for the Commission in many respects. We do not take many fraternity or sorority house projects back through this process. However, I would also suggest that given some of the unique characteristics of variance requests involving our fraternity and sorority structure reconstructions, this procedure may not be an oddity in the future. Many of the land-use related variances that appear at the Board are generally self-created due to the fact that reconstruction is normally building a larger structure on the property, and the variance process is generally predicated on the fact that you have other unique characteristics that you can't overcome. And most of our construction, as I have noted with all of our variances that we have taken through Board, generally all share a same common set of general issues. And the planned district process is probably more appropriately set up to address those from a holistic perspective of how the use fits into the character of the neighborhood and the surrounding development that has occurred. So that is partially what this project will point out to you. However, it is a planned district. It does have a plan, and it still must meet general planned district plan requirements that the Commission has the authority to make recommendation on for City Council to consider. So our staff has been working on this. This,

unfortunately, missed an advertising deadline, or this would have been on your last meeting's agenda, and we worked with the applicant to ensure that we could get it on this next Planning Commission agenda without any impact to their construction schedule. So we will bring this forward to you. It -- it has some interesting components to it, and I think that certain aspects that the Commission may appreciate, and others that may cause you moments of pause, but I'm sure we can answer those for you. Just so you understand where we're at, again, the southwest corner of Smith and Louisville. That is our future preliminary plat for a four-lot subdivision, and then 511 Rollins Street, the home of an existing sorority that's proposing to reconstruct on that site. A lot of full tear down and rebuild, so I'll give you a little just bit of a preview. That's what makes this an interesting project. With that, that's all we have for this evening. And we will continue our conversation on short-term rental. At our next work session, you will have some information provided to you with your packet as it relates to the International Property Maintenance Code, as it relates to occupancy calculations, and we will continue to forge forward with additional use-specific standards that you're wanting to consider. With that, thank you very much for your attention.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

#### **IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a request, an admin request. Mr. Zenner, in the future, we may have more situations like we have at Louisville and Smith, and if you could kindly suggest to Mr. Teddy that he could address those parking things first, because we -- when we get that redevelopment, you know, we have -- had it been new, they couldn't put driveways there; you know what I'm saying? So when -- if you could request of Mr. Teddy, if we could just make sure the parking is -- are you with me?

MR. ZENNER: I'm following what you're suggesting.

MR. MACMANN: Outstanding. Have a great day.

#### **X. ADJOURNMENT**

MR. MACMANN: If there are no other questions or comments by my fellow Commissioners, I move to adjourn.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Second.

MS. LOE: Seconded by Commissioner Geuea Jones. We are adjourned. Thank you, everybody.

(The meeting adjourned at 7:47 p.m.)

(Off the record.)