

**MINUTES**

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**

**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**

**AUGUST 4, 2022**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

**Ms. Sara Loe**

**Ms. Valerie Carroll**

**Ms. Tootie Burns**

**Mr. Anthony Stanton**

**Ms. Sharon Geuea Jones**

**Mr. Michael MacMann**

**Ms. Robbin Kimbell**

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

**Ms. Shannon Wilson**

**Ms. Peggy Placier**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

MS. LOE: I would like to call the August 4th, 2022 Planning and Zoning meeting to order.

**II. INTRODUCTIONS**

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

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Wilson. Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Present.

MS. CARROLL: I am here. Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

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

MS. LOE: Thank you.

**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.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner Geuea Jones, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. We have a motion to approve the agenda. I'll take a thumbs up.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS, LOE: It looks unanimous. Thank you.

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

MS. LOE: Everyone should have received a copy of the July 21st, 2022 regular meeting minutes. Were there any additions or edits to those minutes?

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. We have a motion to approve the minutes. I'll take a thumbs up approval on those?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: It looks unanimous. Thank you.

#### **V. SUBDIVISIONS**

MS. LOE: All right. That brings us to our first case of the evening under Subdivisions.

##### **Case Number 216-2022**

**A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Sonya Andreassen-Henderson (owner), for approval of a two-lot preliminary plat of an R-1 (One-family Dwelling) zoned tract that includes an extension of City sewer to the site, to be known as *Hidden Haven Plat 1*. The 10.53-acre tract of land is located on the north side of Stadium Boulevard, approximately 500 feet east of College Park Drive, but is accessed from the western terminus of Westwinds Drive and is addressed 1607 Westwinds Drive.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the *Hidden Haven Plat 1* preliminary plat, pending some minor technical corrections.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. 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? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Zenner, I hope I'm not too rabbit hole on this.

The vacation of the Westwinds right-of-way, I notice on the map before us, its definition is variable. I'm guessing when that goes to recorder, that will be very precisely laid out so we know exactly where the -- so they know where their property is?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. We will have the legal -- the legal description, a formal legal description will be provided which will give a metes and bounds description of the area to be vacated. The reason variable is there is because the right-of-way of Westwinds varies in width. That has nothing to do with the area in particular.

MR. MACMANN: And I caught that. I'm just making sure. Well, and also to follow up just a little bit on that, is that subject to -- would this be subject to technical corrections as they're sent to the recorder or --

MR. ZENNER: No. That is actually how we describe variable -- a right-of-way that varies in width. We always refer to it as variable. The vacation itself will actually describe that, and that is not a technical correction to this plat, because it will be a separate item brought before Council under different cover.

MR. MACMANN: All right. That's -- a second question is as follows. I'm happy for these people. They can live close to each other. In the future when this could be potentially redeveloped, we'd have to readdress the fire issue, would we not -- fire access issue?

MR. ZENNER: We do, and there is a specific plat notation that has been added. The director made very clear when he authorized the shared private driveway use, it was only going to be appropriate to the two-lot subdivision. Any future subdivision would require permanent public street access to be provided.

MR. MACMANN: Rock and roll. Thank you, sir.

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner, you mentioned access easement to the second lot. I didn't find that on the plat. I was looking for that.

MR. ZENNER: And that is -- typically, that would -- that will come as a part of the final plat, as well. Often, it -- it can happen as a separate document. In this particular instance, because there will be a final plat with this, that is the only way these two lots will work is with a shared driveway, so the final platting action will require that. And I will verify with Mr. Smith, who is running this case, that, in fact, that's not a technical correction that needed to be made. If you would like to make that as a part of your motion this evening for us to verify before we forward to Council, I'm more than welcome to have that made.

MS. LOE: I'm seeing some nods, so I think -- yes, we'll probably --

MR. MACMANN: For clarity and legal safe.

MS. LOE: Yeah. All right. Thank you. Any additional questions for staff?

MS. CARROLL: Good question.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Could you tell us who would be responsible for the City sewer extension?

MR. ZENNER: That would be the applicant would be responsible for that.

MS. LOE: And any more questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open up the floor to public comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. LOE: If you can please give your name and address for the record, and if you can bring the microphone down so we can record every -- all the comments. Thank you.

MR. BECKETT: Sure. Thank you. Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Dan Beckett; I'm an attorney at the offices of Smith Lewis here in Columbia, 200 -- excuse me -- 111, Suite 200, South Ninth Street. The intent of the applicant this evening is to maintain the character of this -- maintain the character of this property as much as they can. The only impetus for this preliminary plat application is so they can demo the old chicken coop that was converted into a multi-family residence and reconstruct it. It's been in the family for -- for the generations, so they're wanting to do whatever they can to -- so appease the City staff and City to get this accomplished. With me this evening is Jay Gebhardt; he's a civil engineer with A Civil Group that prepared the plat, and he can answer some of the technical questions should you have any.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Just -- just to clarify. Do you know if they intend to keep this area forested to the similar extent that it currently is?

MR. BECKETT: They do. They want to maintain as much of the trees -- old-growth trees that they possibly can.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Sir, we had to make some -- in order to get this done, the design adjustments were kind of dropped out and we were able to bring everything in. Do you feel that your clients are comfortable with this and understand all of it going forward, particularly the last thing we said about if this redevelops, we're going to have to take right-of-way back and stuff like that?

MR. BECKETT: Yes, sir. I do know.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. I'm just --

MR. BECKETT: And the intent is not to develop any --

MR. MACMANN: Okay. I just don't want someone, you know, ten years down the road, saying they bought a pig in a poke or something, because they didn't understand what's going on. Thank you.

MR. BECKETT: Thank you, sir.

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

MR. BECKETT: Thank you, ma'am.

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. My name Jay Gebhardt; I'm a civil engineer and surveyor with

A Civil Group. And my clients tonight are Sonya and Kyle Henderson. Sonya's grandparents own this property. Her mother, I think, grew up in that little farmhouse. And when they approached me, they -- they wanted to tear down the chicken coop/three-plex and build a retirement home for themselves. And they did not want to subdivide this. They didn't want to do anything that might indicate it would be developed because they want to preserve the property as it is. They look at this as a little green gem in the middle of Columbia, and they -- they want to preserve it. But because they want to keep the little farmhouse for sentimental reasons, we had to create two lots so that each lot would have a single-family home, so there would be two homes on this. And as part of that, what your question was, Sara, on the access easement, when we turned this in last -- for your packet, a couple of layers got turned off, one of them being the lot numbers, and the other was the text for the access easement. I gave the Planning Department a corrected copy this morning, and on the original, it does show the access easement now and the lot numbers. So sorry about that, but anyone that's worked with AutoCAD kind of knows those things happen, so --

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. GEBHARDT: But, yeah, the -- the intention here is to build a small retirement home for themselves and to preserve the property in its current state. And that -- they'll need to extend the sewer to the property.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Gebhardt. Any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Gebhardt. Any additional speakers on this case?

MS. COOK: Good evening. I'm Jody Cook, 1514 St. Christopher. I own three vacant lots on Westwinds just to the east of where they're going to put the T turnaround. That is a great addition to that road. There is no place for the fire trucks, the garbage trucks to turn around. Seventeen years ago, I filled the lots on Westwinds, and that's used as a turnaround. I am happy with this development. I was really, really worried what was going to happen, and I think it will maintain the integrity of our neighborhood and improve it.

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

MS. WILLOW: Hello, my name is Chris Willow; I'm at 1518 St. Christopher. I have more of a question. Is that appropriate to -- in understanding? My home is actually right next to the right-of-way, and so I'm curious if there is the future potential of development, is there ever the potential that that right-of-way could be a complete street?

MS. LOE: And you're talking about the extension of St. Michael's?

MS. WILLOW: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner, I'm going to pass this one over to you.

MR. ZENNER: So St. Michael could be extended. It could be installed if the adjoining lots beyond where the turnaround is. So the corner lot, if I understand correctly, of where St. Michael's right-

of-way is, this lot here, and I believe the lot to the north, are owned by the applicant, as well. So, typically, what would end up happening is this road right-of-way would be required to be constructed -- improved with future development of the two corner lots. So, yes. St. Michael could be brought up to -- and I, again, I apologize. I don't know what the cross street is that is here, that is immediately to the north and then provides access to the four existing homes that are here and wraps back around. And I think that may be St. Christopher is -- is the first street we come to. So that is a possibility, that the roadway could connect. I think -- if it does connect at that point, it addresses an issue of circulation purposes better than the -- than the turnaround only, but that's going to be driven by development activity. And if I'm not incorrect, we believe that the reason that the lots to the very south end of the St. Michael right-of-way, as well as those to the very north of the St. Michael right-of-way, were never developed due to topographical reasons. The slopes associated with the parcels just do not make them conducive to development. And with that condition existing without significant modification, it is likely that the road network, as it exists today, is going to be the interior loop between St. Christopher and the roadway immediately to the north of it that parallels St. Christopher. We do not foresee, nor do we have plans as a City, to complete the connections.

MS. WILLOW: Thank you for that clarification. My understanding is the current development as presented doesn't necessitate that. That would be future.

MR. ZENNER: No, it does not.

MS. WILLOW: Okay. So I would just also, as a neighbor -- a person that's in the neighborhood very close to where this is, I support it, especially hearing that it's a family that's continuing it, and that the wooded area is going to be preserved. So, thank you. Great.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any additional speakers?

MS. JONES: I'm not a speaker, but I am a questioner. My name is Pamela Jones; I live at 1519 St. Michael Drive, so I live at the, I guess you would say, the northern end. Yeah. The northern end, the far northern end. And I had maybe three questions. I'm just abysmally ignorant on things like this, but when you say you're vacating a road, I have no idea what that means. Can someone explain what that means to vacate something?

MR. ZENNER: So through the platting process, road right-of-way is dedicated or given to the City of Columbia for the future maintenance and operation of roadways or utility easements or whatever. We - - we take dedications of property. Those properties are normally or those areas are normally improved by the developer of the land with the required improvement -- water, sewer, roads -- and then they're turned over to the City for maintenance. When we vacate a piece of property, we generally -- we are -- the City is agreeing to release its right to that area and, in essence, cede it back to the property owner from which it came initially, or in the stance where you've got property on either side that are owned by different individuals, half of that right-of-way is given to one side of the right-of-way, and the other -- the other half goes to the other half.

MS. JONES: Are they responsible for maintenance then of that --

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. And we relinquish all maintenance of the road right-of-way, as well. So the City benefits from a vacation in this instance -- would benefit from the vacation in this instance that we would reduce the overall maintenance costs of pavement. We'd gain, actually, tax revenue based on the fact that the property that is now non-taxed, the road, becomes taxable land because it's incorporated into the applicant's property. If there are utilities that are needed to be maintained within the right-of-way, such as a sewer line or a water line, we'll retain easement rights for the maintenance of those utilities, but otherwise we remove our -- our ownership and maintenance responsibility of anything else. It goes back to the property owner.

MS. JONES: Second question. I saw where it says new compliant turnaround constructed in St. Michael Street row. I don't quite understand what that is.

MR. ZENNER: So this turnaround, the darker area here is what's referred to as the turnaround. So when we review development, development is reviewed through a number of different codes and ordinances. One of them, and the primary one reviewed here, was our subdivision standards. So the particular parcel of property needed to meet specific development requirements and surveying standards to ensure that the parcel was compliant in respect to those statutes and other requirements. Additionally, because a public road is involved here and an access is proposed off of that public road, it needs to meet fire code requirements, and the fire code has a specific standard that says when you have a terminal street that ends and is to be terminated permanently, it needs to be terminated in some form that can accommodate a fire engine to turn around.

MS. JONES: Right.

MR. ZENNER: And that can take a couple of different shapes: A standard cul-de-sac, sometimes they're offset, sometimes they're straight on the end of the roadway. In this particular instance, the fire code allows an alternative to be used, and in this particular instance, this is what would be referred to as a T, so you've got -- Westwinds Drive serves as the --as the bottom of the T, and the stem of the T is basically the darker area. And what that allows for is the fire engine to drive past the T, the stem, back up into the stem, and then come back out and head out -- head first back in the opposite direction.

MS. JONES: What -- what confuses me is that there is no St. Michael Drive that connects with Westwinds.

MR. ZENNER: There is. That is actual -- it's unopened, but it's unimproved public right-of-way that was dedicated when the original Westwinds Subdivision was platted.

MS. JONES: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: So when all of the lots in the Westwinds Subdivision were created, this right-of-way was received, but was never improved because there was no development on it.

MS. JONES: Well, it's also very -- I mean, right at the end of the four houses on St. Michael, it

plunges into a rather deep ravine at that point.

MR. ZENNER: That is correct.

MS. JONES: And so, are you talking about on the other side of the ravine, if that's where the turnaround --

MR. ZENNER: No. If you see -- so if you can see here on the screen, this is -- where my cursor is going right now, so you see these three dots, and you see this line --

MS. JONES: Oh.

MR. ZENNER: -- that's actually the centerline of the stream. So that is the stream channel. This road -- actually, this stem comes off of the existing pavement surface of Westwinds, extends back roughly, if I'm not incorrect, this is 15 -- I think that's -- well, that's a total of 45 feet is what the road right-of-way is for Westwinds. So the space -- this gray is the pavement today --

MS. JONES: Of -- of Westwinds?

MR. ZENNER: The light -- yeah. The light gray is the pavement of Westwinds today. The white area to where the end of this arrow is the actual platted right-of-way. And what that means is the white area is where there is no pavement. It's just -- it's the road bed or the road area that we could have put pavement in. So that is 45 feet, and then you're extending back probably an additional 20 or so feet beyond that to the edge of this gray line.

MS. JONES: We'll never see that on St. Michael.

MR. ZENNER: No. You will never see it north of the creek.

MS. JONES: That's on the other side, yeah.

MR. ZENNER: Because -- yeah. Because you've the ravine that you're going to come into, and it's all wooded.

MS. JONES: I see. Okay.

MR. ZENNER: So that turnaround will never probably impact your enjoyment of the woodland that's along the stream corridor right now.

MS. JONES: I'm just more concerned that -- I frankly don't ever want it connected with Westwinds because we're kind of a nice, almost a cul-de-sac, that part of St. Michael is. They had originally platted that it would be connected with the other St. Michael until they came out and, sure, and looked and saw that it's a sheer drop-off at the end of my property.

MS. LOE: I'm sorry. Can you speak into the microphone?

MS. JONES: Oh, I'm -- I'm so sorry.

MS. LOE: Our recorder needs to hear you.

MS. JONES: Is there anything they didn't hear?

MS. LOE: That's -- that's better. Thank you.

MS. JONES: And so they were never able to put the street through, and that was a benefit to us because that makes us a very kind of hidden little area down in there, and we don't get a lot of cross traffic.

People either live there or they're lost. I mean, that's kind of the situation. The third question I had was I realize the intent now is to preserve everything, but that doesn't mean when -- that these people won't change their mind someday and decide to develop this entire area, and whole forest goes down. And I guess we don't really have much to say about that, potentially.

MR. ZENNER: Well, what I will tell you and I think that this goes to some other regulations that we've got within our subdivision standards. Each of these parcels are both over an acre in size. This is a 10.53-acre tract of land. We have true preservation requirements, significant tree preservation standards that will apply to any parcel one acre or greater. If the site were to be proposed to be developed further, two things are going to end up happening. One, Westwinds Drive will need to be extended in a compliant fashion, so you would have to have a public street to do so. Secondly, the development would have to preserve -- would either -- it would have to preserve a minimum of 25 percent of the climax forest that exists on the property in future development, and any significant tree 20 inches DBH or greater, unless otherwise waived through a -- through the review by our City arborist. And normally to waive significant trees or to allow them to be removed, there is a compensatory factor for that. They have to pay to have them removed to us, because preservation of trees 20 inches or greater are quite significant, and we don't want them away either.

MS. JONES: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: But the 25 percent climax forest is the -- the greater -- the greater hammer, so to speak, as well as there is a stream corridor on this property that will have to be preserved, which further minimizes the amount of future lot yield that could be garnered out of the property. And as you are well aware, the topography of this property from south to north is a little bit challenging for any future significant development.

MS. JONES: Yeah. It would -- I mean, I've seen it done, but -- and I'm kind of anxious about that, not so much because, very likely, I'm getting older. I won't -- I won't live long enough to see something like that happen potentially. But I am -- I'm very into the wildlife there, and -- and they've been -- it's been fascinating to watch over the years. And they really -- the wildlife really depends on that forest, and I would hate to see it go. And so that's why I worry that -- that building a house is a slippery slope to, you know, a wider development of the whole area. But you're telling me that it would take an awful lot of steps to get there?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. And it would actually require more public utility extension, which would mean it would end up again at this body, as well as at City Council before it could even be approved. And because of that, it would open up the opportunity for additional public comment to be made, and Council to be informed by that public comment, as well as this body.

MS. JONES: Okay. Well, those are my questions. I just was -- just had those concerns. So thank you very much.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any additional speakers on this case? If there are none, we will close

public comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

MS. LOE: Commission comment? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners have no questions or comments -- Mr. Stanton, did you -- I have a motion. In the matter of Case 216-2022, the preliminary plat of Hidden Haven with technical corrections, I move to approve.

MS. KIMBELL: Second it.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Kimbell. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Didn't you propose making sure that the legal --

MS. LOE: The access easement.

MR. STANTON: -- access easement was addressed.

MR. ZENNER: Covered by the technical correction.

MR. MACMANN: That allows that to be filled.

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

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 7-0.**

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

MS. LOE: Thank you. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

**VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

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

**Case Number 212-2022**

**A request by Haden & Colbert (agent), on behalf of Omkara, LLC (Owner), seeking the rezoning of property located at 1414 Ballenger Lane, from PD (Planned District) to M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood). The subject property currently consists of two lots totaling 10.8 acres, and is located northeast of the intersection of Ballenger and Clark Lanes.**

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 rezoning to M-N.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Before we move on to questions for staff, I would like to ask any Commissioners if they have had any ex parte to please share that with the Commission at this time so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information in the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff?

MS. CARROLL: Actually, yes.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Small question.

MR. MACMANN: Small question. In the previous code, what in the world was an armory? Was it for the storage and repair of armaments or --

MR. PALMER: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: But not a shooting range?

MR. PALMER: No. No. No. In the terms of -- yeah. Military storage and --

MR. MACMANN: All right. I just -- just wanted to make sure that we weren't slipping in the tool arsenal or something like that.

MR. PALMER: No.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Just checking.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Similarly, I was going to ask if you could define process laboratory.

MR. ZENNER: That actually is a -- I think when Rusty showed what was on the slide for a research and development lab, that is -- R&D could be using chemicals that would require a chemical list that need to be approved, so it's a C -- that's an open use, an allowed use. However, materials lists, we have -- we have a lab, actually, that's out next to Stephens Lake Park in an office building that required a materials list to be received by the fire service before they were authorized to operate to ensure that what chemicals were going to be used in that facility were going to be able to be accommodated if there were an emergency response. So that's the type of thing that occurs on the back end when you look at it. But a research and development laboratory could be a place that's doing vaccine development or something of that nature. So again, more of an office type of use, but with potentially a hazard component associated with it, and that would be what would be opened up on the site, and that's what the research and development laboratory relates to with today's code.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks. I just have not heard the word process laboratory used, and I believe that I work in one of them. We don't call them that.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: The single dwelling that's there, is that -- are there -- is that owned by someone or is it --

MR. PALMER: It's owned by -- by this developer.

MS. KIMBELL: Okay.

MR. PALMER: I think the intent is that it would come down, but I -- I haven't verified that, but it's assumed.

MS. KIMBELL: That's what I needed clarification on. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? I see none. And with that, we will open up the floor to public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.**

MS. LOE: If you could provide us your name and address for us, the Commission, since we're the only ones here.

MR. COLBERT: Good evening, Madam Chair. Caleb Colbert, attorney, at 827 East Broadway. I won't go into great detail. I think Mr. Palmer covered everything. Essentially, the goal here is to consolidate and eliminate sort of the split zoning where we have one parcel with multiple planned district regulations on it. And when we looked at the site, being at the intersection of Ballenger and Clark Lane, we felt like the M-N was sort of the most appropriate zoning classification for the intersection. With that, I would be happy to answer any questions.

MS. LOE: Another small question from Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a quick comment to Mr. Colbert. We've been pushing for nodes for quite some time, and usually those are M-N. And the fact that someone would willing do that, kind of -- not insist they had to have M-C or something like that, I just appreciate that.

MR. COLBERT: Sure.

MR. MACMANN: Regardless. I mean, as long as you don't end up putting an armory in there, then I'm fine.

MR. COLBERT: I'm with you. I don't know what that means, so I --

MR. MACMANN: Well, I know what an armory is, but in -- like, in Pat speak -- excuse me -- in City Planner speak -- I didn't mean to diss you so bad, Pat. What, we can do that? I didn't remember that from the UDC, but thank you for doing that, because we are working on nodes. Thank you very much.

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

MR. COLBERT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: And with that, I'm going to close public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. LOE: Commission comments? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: If there's not any more questions from my colleagues --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I will be very quick. I just want to put on the record, this is another planned district that's been sitting there forever completely undeveloped. I am just marking it for the record because it happens a lot, and we rarely talk about it. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Well spoken. As it relates to Case 212-2022, 1414 Ballenger Lane rezoning, I move to approve for rezoning from PD to M-N.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner MacMann. 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. Kimbell, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 7-0.**

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

MS. LOE: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. And that concludes our cases for the evening, and our public comments for the evening, I think.

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

There were no further public comments.

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

MR. ZENNER: Your next meeting will be on August 18th. It will be short. A Commission member, Ms. Loe, will be out of town, so everybody else show up so we have quorum. We do have a couple of items or I should say, not a couple, we only have one. Ms. Loe picks the right meeting to be gone for. However, maybe not. This is a quite complex request. This is at 701 East Richland Road. This is the development that is immediately to the northeast of Old Hawthorne North, intersection of Olivette Road and East Richland Road, large preliminary plat, 300-plus lots. And we are currently working through some transportation-related, so, at this point, we anticipate it will be on the agenda. There will probably likely be some technical comments associated with it. This is an entitled R-1 zoned piece of property, though, and has been annexed into the City of Columbia for quite some time. To give you an idea of where it is, it's an enormous parcel of property, as well, accommodating the lots that are proposed. And you will notice the water body in the middle of the property on the eastern side. That is to be retained as part of the development layout. And then, of course, we have the intersection of Richland and Olivette, which -- and the extension of Olivette as it runs up the east side of the property incorporated with that in that preliminary plat. Mr. Smith will be delivering this report and will have the -- have more details associated with it. So this is a single-family development, and if I recall correctly, it is somewhat of a homogeneous single-family product. This is not similar to what we dealt with down at Legacy Farms where we had a multitude of housing product within it. And then the property immediately to the south of it that's zoned R-1 to the southwest, that is Old Hawthorne North, so that's the proximity between the back entrance to Old Hawthorne, and then this particular project. That is the only case that we have on the agenda for your regular sessions. Work session for the August 18th meeting will be split in half. We will have Mr. Skov back to talk about the sidewalk master plan and any questions that you may have. If possible, if you do have them, and to make the meeting more productive out of the gate, provide those possibly to me in advance, and I can have Mr. Skov prepare to maybe provide some response to that to make it a little bit more streamlined. Again, what the purpose is for the discussion of the sidewalk master plan is to allow Mr. Skov, who is one of the liaisons with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission, to take those comments back to them prior to scheduling a public hearing on the sidewalk master plan before the Planning Commission. So we want to make sure that we close the loop well enough to do so. The latter half of the work session then will be Mr. Smith providing opportunity for the Commission to vote up-down

on several of the criterion for the drive-throughs revision that we have been working on over the last several commission meetings, as well as I believe we will probably bring forward the lower hanging fruit amendments that we talked about, the revisions to the C-2, the elimination of C-2 out of the code, and some other less complex requests. The one that dealt also with downtown utility easements will be the one that will also come back in its more final format. Following that, we will hopefully be able to get back onto discussing in September our revisions to the -- or our proposed regulations for short-term rental, which were provided to you with this packet with several parenthetical or not rhetorical, but questions back to the Commission for clarification purposes. So if you have not had an opportunity to look at that, look at the sidebar commentary that I provided as I was drafting those standards based on comments I had received. I just need some additional clarification before we get too much further along to make sure that we're heading in the right direction. With that, we thank you for your time this evening, and we will look forward to seeing you on the 18th.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

**IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

There were no comments from Commissioners.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Move to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. We are adjourned. Thanks, everyone.

(Off the record.)

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.)