

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**October 20, 2022**

**Case Number 281-2022**

**A request by AMERCO Real Estate Company (Contract Purchaser), for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a self-service storage facility over 14 feet in height, located at 3615 Vandiver Drive, on the west side of Highway 63.**

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report.

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the request to permit issuance of a conditional use permit authorization for the construction of a self-service storage facility greater than 14 feet in height on property addressed as 3615 Vandiver Drive, subject to compliance with the use-specific standards of Section 29-3.3(w) of the UDC prior to building permit issuance.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we get to staff questions, do any Commissioners have information they received from outside sources they would like to share with the rest of the Commission? Seeing none, questions for staff? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: This may be a Mr. Zenner question. Have we seen this property before, specifically, represented by perhaps Mr. Farnan or associates of Mr. Farnan, and it was turned down? Am I remembering the right piece of property?

MR. PALMER: It was a zoning --

MR. ZENNER: Well, we had the zoning issue, and then Mr. Land, who is the owner of this property at this point, Paul Land, had come in and had proposed three separate semi-industrial buildings on the property that were -- I cannot remember why they were not approved.

MR. MACMANN: Just let me skip forward a little bit. I remember at that juncture, there were neighbors to the east, and notably pretty far to the east, who had some concerns with Mr. Land's development, and I'm guessing they didn't have any concerns with this or did not respond?

MR. ZENNER: I was contacted -- that may be an incorrect assumption. I was contacted today by a Ms. Dunn, who, I believe, was one of the principal --

MR. MACMANN: She spoke?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. And I believe she was one of the principal residents along Mexico Gravel. Apparently, there was difficulty in getting in contact with our offices and the sign, due to some weather-related battering, was still upright, however, not really visible. And so she had made first phone call two

days ago, apparently didn't get any contact. Made another call. Finally made a call today, this afternoon before today's meeting. I provided her all of our information that we had this evening, and I notice there's an individual here in the audience that I'm not familiar with. They may have additional information to provide, as well. Ms. Dunn's property, if I recall correctly from the original rezoning request, is well outside of the distribution area for our notice. There is not -- there is not a defined neighborhood association either that that location is part of, and therefore, we rely on the newspaper publishing. We rely on the property posting. And just to make very clear, we are only obligated to advertise in a newspaper of general circulation. That is the statutory requirement. The City has adopted additional standards to provide conspicuous sign location on the property indicating that it's subject to a public hearing, and then to provide property and neighborhood association letters, which we did do with this in accordance to our provisions. Unfortunately for issues beyond my control, the sign became somewhat nonreadable, and therefore, required that they get out of their car. They saw the poles, got out of the car, pulled the sign apart, found the phone number, and then apparently couldn't contact me.

MR. MACMANN: I just -- I have a -- I just wanted to make sure this was the property, and what their concerns with, and if they called, I guess they get another bite at the apple before Council.

MR. ZENNER: And that is what I informed the -- that's what I informed Ms. Dunn. I have provided her the elevations that were shown here today with the explanation that they are conceptual. They are not the exact elevations. I also have explained to her, when I did talk with her today, that the Commission does have the authority to provide additional restrictions upon the property, and that the site plan has not -- we have not formally received plans, but the site plan was part of the staff report, as well.

MR. MACMANN: The thing, though -- the concern that I have, and I think this has been addressed, is, if I recall correctly, Mr. Land's development had the creek in it, and there was an issue with that. There was a water issue, and this development does not have that lot in it.

MR. ZENNER: There were -- I cannot recall the issue associated with his proposed building presentation.

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MR. ZENNER: The principal concern that was expressed with the rezoning of the property was that the M-C zoning district allowed for sexually oriented businesses that were previously excluded per the C-P zoning that went to this property, and other objectionable uses that residents may have to drive by on their way to 63 and services further towards the center of the City. I don't -- I know that there were issues with Mr. Land's proposal, but I would have to go back and look at that particular file.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. I just wanted to make sure. To our knowledge, there is floodplain, storm sewer issues? I believe, if I'm recalling correctly, it was the entire island, if you will?

MR. PALMER: There was actually a question about an interpretation of the UDC as it pertained to floodplain during the platting of this property, I believe. And I don't remember exactly how it played out, but there is floodplain on this property.

MR. MACMANN: But it's at that south end; am I correct?

MR. PALMER: Yes. But the larger building actually will partially sit in the floodplain. If you look at the map on your screen, the yellow line that cuts through the site on that southeast corner, that's the floodplain, and directly east of that.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I -- I wanted to address those issues specifically, because I was, like, I've seen this piece of property before.

MR. PALMER: Right.

MR. ZENNER: And I think to speak and elaborate on that, Ms. Loe may as well, the floodplain issue is one that is governed by other Code requirements, so development within an identified floodplain is required to be built two feet above the base flood elevation as established. That is going to mean that they'll be required to get a floodplain development permit in order to develop in that particular portion of the site. My recollection also with the platting action was is there was an access issue with the driveway to the southern lot, which will be resolved, as well, with the site plan submission for actual construction plans. As Mr. Palmer pointed out, he was standing in a return that was provided to this property as part of the construction of the connection of the two roundabouts. I can't remember the details associated with the southern parcel and its access, if it was intended to be shared where that property line is shown, which is outside, I believe, or just barely maybe within the floodplain, and I think that that was part of what the conversation was in the platting action is that a driveway placement in that particular location may disrupt natural water flow. So again, there are other Code requirements as a part of the actual formal development submission that are going to have to be achieved. One of them is going to be how height is actually measured on this site, because height defined within our Code is measured from the average grade plain. The average grade plain is away from the actual building footprint, and that may actually define an area that is lower than the grade elevations that currently exist, which means that the overall building height is going to have to be adjusted accordingly if, in fact, there is no additional restriction on building height. So I think one of the primary questions and some observation that I made after Ms. Loe sent her comments in that I likely should have caught as this report was written, there was no request for what the maximum height of this building would be. And I think in our defense, this is an M-C zoning district, and it was intuitive to us that it was, okay, they're asking to build a building over 14 feet in height, but it is not going to be greater than what the zoning district allows, which is 45. And so whatever is approved here is the Commission's discretion, but, in no instance, the building will ever be over 45 feet in height.

MR. MACMANN: I don't have a problem with that. We're just -- we had problems before with this piece of property, and I wanted to make sure that this is CUP and we have the give and take possibility, and we get a little more information. I wanted to make sure that that came out here. I believe Commissioner Loe has something to ask. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe, would you like to ask questions of staff?

MS. LOE: To follow up on the floodplain. Mr. Palmer, if you can go back to your site photo -- one more. That one. So one of the reasons I asked about the floodplain was because the three-story building

does appear to overlap the FPO and will need to have the first-floor elevation two feet above the floodplain or be waterproofed below. And give the proposed use, I'm assuming they'll go with the former. The lower elevation is toward the Vandiver. So while this site does slope down towards Vandiver, per my discussion with Mr. Palmer, essentially, they're going to be bringing -- a likely scenario, and the applicant can confirm or speak to this when they come up -- is bringing in fill to raise this edge of the site two feet above the floodplain level. So this side will come up another two, two and a half, three feet to level that off. So since we are talking about building height and mass of building, to me, it was important to understand what we might be measuring the height from. As far as height, and Mr. Zenner knows we've wrestled with this. This is another one of my pet definitions, but since the lot line is more six feet from the perimeter of the building, my understanding is that the grade elevation, grade plain would be taken at six feet from the building. So, yeah, so it may fall off, but given that they're bringing -- typically it's finished grade, so -- and given that they're paving the whole site. So the whole -- one of the -- the easternmost one-story storage building below is fully in the FPO zone. So -- and given that's being accessed as single-story storage, I'm assuming that whole grade is going to have to be brought up to bring that building up. So we're going to see that whole end of the site be brought up with fill, as well. So just wanted to be cognizant that we're doing that based on where they're proposing to locate the buildings and should be taking that into consideration with the height on the taller one. Mr. Palmer, you mentioned in your presentation that the exterior colors are regulated, but didn't mention that the materials are regulated, as well, so I just wanted to confirm that?

MR. PALMER: I believe it's more of a requirement to have variation in materials.

MS. LOE: Item VI(b) states the exterior of the building shall be constructed entirely of brick, stone, precast concrete panels that include a masonry facade or other architectural elements, split face block or other similar high-quality materials, prefabricated metal panels and smooth-faced concrete blocks shall be prohibited. We're pretty specific about those materials. We spent a long time on this section, so we looked at some specific materials. You also stated -- the reason I'm bringing it up is in your review, you said that the materials and the preliminary elevations, which I don't believe we got, so I may have missed this and just seen the notes come up. I think it said stucco. I wouldn't consider stucco to be on par with those materials I just listed.

MR. PALMER: I mean, so all of that will be reviewed again, as part of the final construction plans. So, I mean, they would be subject to a review in accordance with those provisions in the Code, so --

MS. LOE: Okay. Well, I'm having a little bit of difficulty in that we didn't get the elevations, and the review is now indicating some things in the elevations may have been acceptable, and I'm questioning those. Another item -- so if we can go back to the axon showing the three-dimensional rendering.

MR. PALMER: Tell me where to stop then.

MS. LOE: That one. So another one of our requirements is that in addition to screening and landscape standards, one street -- actually, can I start with, is there a right-of-way along 63? Is 63

considered to have a right-of-way?

MR. PALMER: (No audible answer.)

MS. LOE: Okay. So in addition to screening and landscape standards, one street tree shall be placed every 40 linear feet of site frontage along any property line that abuts a right-of-way in order to screen the mass of the building. So I just want to confirm that we are going to have trees every 40 feet all around this property, because we have right-of-ways all around.

MR. PALMER: Do you want to express this --

MR. ZENNER: I mean, that would be -- I'd have to verify, in fact, that expressways, because it's not a controlled street by the City, it's a MoDOT street, it would apply. I think the assumption would be that it would be screened. Again, it's a unique situation where we're not accustomed normally to having a street that's not part of our City system abutting one of its frontages. Perimeter landscaping, in general, is going to require -- or I should say landscaping, in general, because of the paved surface on the site. There's one tree per 4,500 square feet of paved area, which means it's very possible if they're not on the road right-of-way, they're going to be required in the parking field somewhere. And what I would probably conclude is, given the type of use that this is, they're not going to want street -- they're not going to want parking lot trees in the middle of their parking lot maneuvering trailers and trucks around, so they're going to want to work with our arborist to try to offset those trees from where they would normally be so we're still achieving the goal, while not completely avoiding it. The option that exists if, in fact, they want to waive landscaping requirements, that is a Board of Adjustment related matter. So if, in fact, this was just a regular commercial development of a hotel or some other use, not one that required a conditional use, they would be entitled to the exact same procedure to seek relief. And, you know, I -- one, I want to look at the Code, because I don't know if we do have an exception for expressways because, in certain instances, we do expressly waive particular requirements along those types of roads, but I don't think we do in the Code, so it would be assumed that adjoining that public right-of-way, you're going to be putting trees in there, but I don't want to say that for certain without looking at it, because I don't apply our landscape ordinance on a regular basis. That's our arborist and our building or site development staff. So there are some options here that probably we would be working with the applicant to make sure that there's compliance achieved in maybe modified fashions, but the site definitely is not going to be devoid of vegetation because, as you just pointed out, it's almost 100 percent paved. That creates a whole another issue for storm-water purposes in a floodplain and everything else that they're going to have to wrestle with as it relates to site and civil engineering on this property. I believe the limitation in receiving plans has to deal with the uncertainty if approval will even be given for this use on this property. And so to invest in that type of design work without knowing if they're going to have the land use approved, it is -- you know, it's a balancing act on their end of the spectrum, as well. And I think you all probably can appreciate that. We're pretty confident in our review staff's capability to make sure that the Code is applied as it has to be once we get the land use issue resolved.

MS. LOE: Fully understood. Appreciate the comments. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any member of the public here to comment on this case? Please come forward, state your name and address for the record, speak closely to the microphone, please, and six minutes if you are speaking for a group, and three if you're for an individual. Thank you.

MR. SELF: My name is Aaron Self at 800 Business Loop 70 West. I represent the U-Haul Company, so I'm up here mostly just to answer your questions that you have for us. The tree question is not going to be a problem. Well, our other project that we have at 800 Business Loop 70 going right now went through site review. They provided us a landscaping plan. We have no problem doing that. We -- we planted several trees to buffer the existing neighborhood that's there now, so that's not going to be a problem. Our site plan where it's actually located at now is not a definite that that's where the buildings are going to sit yet because we haven't invested a ton in site plan development until we find out about the CUP for sure, which is what we're seeking here tonight. Now the 45 feet, the reason we're doing that is they kind of shrunk our building on Business Loop 70 to 35 feet, and we can't get all of our trucks inside that building for customers to use to unload at, so that's why we're seeking the extra 45 feet there -- the extra ten feet over our existing building. But I'll answer any other questions that you all have, as long as it's in my realm of knowledge anyway, because I'm not a developer, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. I don't know is always acceptable to --

MR. SELF: But this side of the routine has been excellent on our other project, so I don't have any problems with that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Thank you for answering questions. So its height limit was not identified, it was just the maximum height was listed, but there wasn't a limit or a height identified, so --

MR. SELF: We're seeking -- sure. We're seeking the 45 feet is what we're looking to get, which is similar to, like, what a new car lot would be or a supermarket or anything along those lines that would go on a piece of property, as well.

MS. LOE: Is the building on Business Loop two-story?

MR. SELF: It is three-story.

MS. LOE: It is three-story.

MR. SELF: Uh-huh. Right.

MS. LOE: But they're shorter three-story because --

MR. SELF: It was shrunk down to the 35 feet because it abutted residential to the -- to the back side of the property, so --

MS. LOE: All right. Thank you.

MR. SELF: -- we planted extra landscaping there for that reason.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Are the one-story units that are in the area in questions, the floodplain area, those are not set in stone then?

MR. SELF: No. None of the buildings right now are set in stone. We just have that initial site plan that we provided for everyone to just kind of see what we're looking to put on the property. We did realize that those are in a floodplain and that there might have to be some elevation changes there and grading done, but we don't -- we don't have that set in stone until we know exactly whether we get the actual CUP for the height and then provide a finalized site plan, construction documents and everything for the site review plan, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? All right. Thank you very much.

MR. SELF: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any other members of the public here to speak on this case? Seeing none.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a question for Chairperson Loe. She's obviously studied this much more deeply than I have, and I appreciate that. We're the ones who set it at 35, if I recall correctly. A lot of this is going to PSD when they get their permits and submit their -- I'm asking you. Do you think that we need to insert other controls or safeguards?

MS. LOE: With regard to?

MR. MACMANN: Well, we have a -- we have the CUP in our hand right now. We have the ability to do some things. Right now, it's just a CUP, but there's a lot of stuff to make this site work. You know, that's what I'm saying. This is a lot of asphalt, it's a floodplain, it's kind of big. I don't have a problem with it, I just want to make sure it's correct. So I'm asking you, do you think it's going -- do you think we need to address anything in that fashion because you've put so much time and energy into this project?

MS. LOE: The height limit, as the speaker just observed, on the Business Loop building was established in part because it butted up against to R-1, and that was a concern. PSD will deal with whatever requirements coming on for the building.

MR. MACMANN: I'm just -- my concern is the floodplain. Did you have anything besides the height and the floodplain -- the materials?

MS. LOE: This will go through review for requirements for being in the floodplain. And again, that -- that will be covered. They will submit those documents. So I -- I don't -- I'm not -- I wanted to understand what that meant to the building and what we were reviewing it for, but I'm not concerned, or I don't think we have anything to necessarily do for that. To be frank, my biggest concern is, if I may paraphrase John Dunne, no site is an island entire of itself. Every parcel is part of a community. I think what we have here is simply the first site to be developed in this stretch, and I'm -- I am thinking of the neighbors that came forward when we were reviewing the last proposal, who walk that trail and were

hoping that they there would be uses coming in along this area that they could -- that would populate their activities. And I'm wondering if this is laying down the precedent for what -- how the rest of that area -- it's a PD above and below this, and I don't know what the statements of intent are for those PD, but we know those can change. And this could have gone many different ways, and I'm wondering if this is establishing the way that will go, and I'm conflicted about that.

MR. MACMANN: I do have -- let me finish. I do have -- I do have concerns. There is a need, given the overall shortage. This is not a commercial for you guys. Given the overall shortage of storage places, because I've -- I've read about it and I actually tried to exercise some storage space activity last year, and that was a total and complete another -- it just -- there was nothing available at any price. I'm a little worried about the execution a little bit, and that's why I brought it up to you, but I don't have a problem with this going forward. I am a little concerned our neighbors aren't here, and if I recall correctly, we had this exact signage problem about two or three months ago, another site, another position. I don't remember where it was, to be honest with you. Mr. Teddy addressed it.

MS. LOE: To tell the truth, that's why I'm sort of heading in the direction of buffering this as much as possible so that future development can still take whatever direction it might take, and we have some options open to us in the UDC and hence, my questions ensuring that those measures be -- are in place or to what extent are those in place. And we wrestled -- the whole reason that the limit was set at 14 feet for M-C is because there is real concern about this type of -- nothing against storage. Fully understand that it's a need, but it's -- it's a difficult building type as far as engaging the community. And just wanting to have some parameters in place to help -- to help make that more productive. So I just want to make sure we're using those to the extent we can.

MR. MACMANN: I think it's something to -- Madam Chair, I'm sorry. I sort of still have the floor. I apologize.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I know, you just take over the meeting. That's fine.

MR. MACMANN: I think the -- the response to just north of this and just south of this are roundabouts, and just west of it is a roundabout. The anti-communitarian activity would be on that trail across the creek, but I do totally get, you know, we have the -- what's that on Big Bear down there, we have that storage facility, and that's just like a no human, no animal zone. You just can't -- just nothing. It's fenced, it's dark. I mean, I appreciate that. But I just, Chair -- Commissioner Loe -- sorry. And if you want to put some buffers or barriers in there, you just go right ahead.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe, go ahead.

MR. MACMANN: I yield the floor.

MS. LOE: I think staff has confirmed that the materials measure is still in place and effective and will be reviewed for -- we may have the additional -- or the tree may apply on all sides, and we have some comments from the applicant indicating that compliance with the landscaping isn't an issue. Was there anything -- those are the measures that appear to be available to us in the Code.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: I wonder if there's any concern about the amount of pavement? I mean, it's extraordinary, and I realize this is an auto, vehicle-focused kind of enterprise, but there is no break at all in the amount of paved area.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: That would be addressed in part with the review that's provided because of the floodplain --

MS. PLACIER: Okay.

MS. LOE: -- that they need to do. And because of that, they need to prove that the runoff is addressed in a certain way. Staff may have a better way to comment on this.

MS. PLACIER: But beyond runoff, in other areas where we have seen, you know, new development like this, there has been more of a break in the asphalt for islands of plantings or that kind of thing. There's nothing here. It's just -- and so the runoff will be an issue, but also, it's aesthetically --

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner's comment about trees being required in the parking, that kicks in once the parking area gets over to a certain size.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So -- go ahead, Commissioner Burns, and then I --

MS. BURNS: No. Please.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, I was just going to say, I think it's strangely ironic that by granting them a CUP, we may be able to control some of that a little bit more as additional conditions on the CUP than if, instead, we said, no, you're limited to the 14 feet. We may actually end up with a worse environmental outcome by not granting them the additional height, because by granting the additional height, we can add even more tree requirements or something like that. So it's interesting how -- Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. This is what it is. It's a storage unit development. And so the pavement issue is because large trucks will be coming in here and loading and unloading. And as much as I would like to see trees or breaks --

MS. PLACIER: I'm aware of that.

MS. BURNS: Yes. -- in that -- I'm -- I don't think we can come up with arbitrary conditions tonight. I think we have to decide if what we've heard is appropriate in our voting, but as far as trying to come up with possible arbitrary conditions, I'm -- I wouldn't be in favor of that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other comments, Manager Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Just to let you know, I mean, the Code already specifies that a minimum of 15 percent of the site is going to have to remain an open space anyways. If you wanted to create a condition that would potentially assist maybe in not crediting the amount of area allocated to perimeter -- perimeter or interior landscaping being able to count towards that 15 percent, that would then increase the amount of -- the amount of green space that's not otherwise required interior. So, basically, what you're going to end up doing now -- again, depending on how the site is developed, the lower southern end of this property may be all left in natural area once they start to run the numbers on what the effort to elevate

that property may be. So allowing the applicant that flexibility to be able to relocate uses that they've shown on this site plan for the purposes of saying this is generally what we would like to do. We haven't done the details, and we really don't want to do the details until we know we can get the building -- the primary building that we really would like, I think is -- it's -- in my mind, it's a reasonable approach for them to take at this point. They want an assurance that they can get something built here, but they also acknowledge that they still have to meet all of our requirements. Now if you want to specify as a condition that you want more open space, and you want to be able to justify how you want to do that, 15 percent is the minimum, 15 percent is normally inclusive of the landscaped areas that they would be otherwise required to put in along their perimeters, specify that the 15 percent open space is exclusive of the perimeter landscaped features that are required by other landscaping requirements. They've got a lot of roadway frontage here, folks. And as a result of that, you're potentially going -- and they have a lot of parking and paving that's going to trigger other requirements. So, you know, that type of restriction is going to force possibly a decision to be made that that whole southern portion of the site that's in the floodplain isn't developed, or they may have to choose to be more selective on how much of the lot that's out of the floodplain is going to be paved. So they may have to make some operational decisions on how big of our -- how big of aprons do we have to have in order to allow trucks to maneuver. How many trucks do we need to have on this site because we also have another site in Columbia that we can shuttle trucks between. Those are types of things that I think that are -- those are -- those are reasonable conditions to be applied if that's your concern, and I think that there's a rational connection between that condition and what you're trying to achieve.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Other comments from Commissioners? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Manager Zenner, I'm going to need your help. Okay? I'm going to move to approve this, and I know some of you probably won't like it, and that's fine. We'll just send it to Council. Make a motion to approve the CUP that encompasses what Mr. -- what Pat said -- what Mr. Zenner said.

MR. ZENNER: Let the minutes reflect it's what Pat said.

MR. MACMANN: And that may be a thing. Counselor Thompson, do you need me to clarify that a little bit more.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If I may, Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Certainly.

MS. THOMPSON: It sounds like what you're saying is that you want to move to approve the CUP authorizing the self-storage facility exceeding 14 feet in height subject to compliance with Section 29-3.3(w) and to a minimum open space requirement of 15 percent, not including any other landscaping requirements.

MR. MACMANN: What she said, I believe, is the appropriate

---

MR. ZENNER: Landscape -- other -- other required landscape areas.

MS. THOMPSON: Other required landscaped areas.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. MACMANN: And then that way the designers can figure it out.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton.

Any discussion, questions about what we're doing?

MS. KIMBELL: Could you restate what it is we're voting on one more time for clarify?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. So we're approved a storage facility over 14 feet in height with the 3.3(w) requirements, but also 15 percent of the site has to be open in addition to the landscaping they're required to do because of the additional height.

MR. ZENNER: Exclusive. Exclusive. The 15 percent is exclusive of the required landscape areas.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Correct. So they have to do all the trees and then they have to do another 15 percent.

MS. KIMBELL: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? I'm not trying to rush this. Okay. If we're ready, may we please have a roll call.

MS. LOE: Yes, Madam Chair.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns. Voting No. Commissioner Kimbell. Motion carries 7-0.**

MS. LOE: Eight in support, one against. The motion is supported.

MR. ZENNER: Seven to support, one against.

MS. LOE: Oops. Thank you. Not being able to count goes with the job. Sorry. No. No disrespect. I've been a secretary before.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.