

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**February 9, 2023**

**Case Number 69-2023**

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of P1316, LLC (owner), for approval of a major amendment to the existing *Discovery Professional Offices PD Plan* to permit a four-story hotel and subdivision of the property into two lots. The new PD Plan would be known as the *Discovery Hotel PD Plan*. The site is currently split-zoned between PD (Planned Development) and M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor) zoning. This request includes rezoning the M-C portion (2.79 acres) to PD so that the whole site will be zoned PD. The approximately 4.09-acre property is located on the east side of Nocona Parkway, west of Ponderosa Street, approximately 500 feet south of the intersection of Ponderosa and Nocona, and includes the address 4510 Nocona Parkway.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Before we hear a staff report, are there any members of the Commission that wish to recuse themselves on this case? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: May I be recused, Madam Chair?

MS. GEUEA JONES: You are excused.

MR. STANTON: All righty.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And may we please have a staff report when you are ready?

Staff report given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends:

1. Approval of the rezoning of property from M-C to PD.
2. Approval of the major amendment in the PD Plan for Discovery Hotel PD Plan.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for Staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had any outside contact with parties or other interested groups, please disclose that now so that we can all benefit from the same information. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I -- my question actually is about what is possible now on Lot 2. I assume that the 65-foot height is going to apply there, but are there any other limitations?

MR. SMITH: Currently, or if they got the rezoning?

MS. PLACIER: If they got the rezoning.

MR. SMITH: If they got the rezoning So it would be subject to the same statement of intent here,

so they would have the same use restrictions there, and they would be restricted to 65 as opposed to the 100-foot height limit that they have now. They would be still subject to all the same overall green space and impervious surface conditions that are throughout the entire Discovery Park Subdivision -- or development, excuse me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other -- Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a -- I guess a comment for Manager Zenner. This doesn't affect this property. The 45 percent EIFS, I've been doing construction since EIFS came in, the current form of EIFS and the others. I would really go for a lower percentage because they -- their maintenance costs would be less over time, even though they might have to spend more up front on the materials. An EIFS really breaks down, and if we're going for any kind of architectural feature at all, it doesn't present well, so just for future reference. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? I -- I do have a question, I suppose. The way that this statement of intent is done where they basically said we want every use except the ones we struck through in the permitted use table, that seems odd to me, or is that just my -- I haven't been here for 15 years bit?

MR. SMITH: Well, I mean, we do get a variety of -- of proposals. And so this -- in this case, it is very similar to the way the rest of the Discovery Park was done originally. And so if you look at the Discovery Park, the current statement of intent for all the zoning, most of those are all commercial uses except for a few ones they've eliminated. So this is very consistent with that, and that's generally how we like to try to approach this as if they are amending something within a district, we're going to generally be acceptable if they say we're changing some parameters, but the uses we really want to keep the same as what was there before. And so these uses are generally what was there currently in the PD section.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It's also the first time I've seen a PD plan without a plan.

MR. SMITH: We have -- it is -- it's not unheard of to have one empty lot, so this does allow them to have some development on that site while still having some potential area there, that they would come back and do a major amendment at that point, too, so it would still come back before this Board. The alternative there would have been a technicality kept -- could have kept it as one lot and then it's a one-lot development, they're just not building on all of it. But in this case, it didn't seem necessarily the best route to do that, so we just had them -- they proposed that the two lots set up with the hotel on one and one vacant one that would come back again. And that's -- we've done that in a few locations, I think, but, generally, with the new provisions, you are required to have a development plan come forward. And this does constitute a development plan, so there is a plan on the site, it's just not fully developed at this point.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Fair enough. Any -- oh, sorry.

MR. ZENNER: And just -- just so you're fully informed, what you will see in the future, when we have planned district projects come forward, undeveloped and unfoot-printed of properties are going to become the norm. Developed site plans that put fictitious buildings on them that may or may not be built serves this Commission nor the public any value. It is the design parameters that are far more essential

to determine the bulk and mass. And so we are gravitating toward, with a couple of projects we currently have the pipeline, to those models, to where we are not having footprints shown because the developer doesn't know what they want. And the real name of the game here when you do planned development is is you want to inform the public of what the maximum opportunity is on that property -- setbacks, percentage landscaping, impervious cover, all of which are covered within the original 2004 ordinance which those provisions are coming forward. As Mr. Smith pointed out, the undeveloped piece is going to be subject to that. Now the benefit we have here, you have a plan, a two-lot plan with a lot not even being developed, not shown with anything. That automatically sets the tone that it constitutes a major revision because the plan is a two-lot plan, but you don't have development shown on the second lot. In instances where we will come forward, the entitlement side, which is typically what we take through when we define with the -- with the former process where you have fictitious building footprints, it is going to -- you will identify a lot layout, which is what's more important. People want to know how many lots, and how then are those lots physically going to be controlled -- setbacks, screening, and all the like. Plans that we will see in the future will probably have no building footprints on them, and each individual lot shown in that entitled area will have to come back through each one by themselves when sold. So this is a -- this is a pattern and a shift that we're moving toward. Based on what we have heard over the years that changing footprints really causes a lot of angst in the public and really doesn't serve a whole lot of value up front. So, hence, we'll be back with -- we'll be back with a plan on Lot 2, and it will probably be somewhat similar to what you see on Lot 1.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, I will wait until we get to Commissioner comment to say what I think about all that. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any members of the public who would like to come forward and speak, please do. Get as close to the microphone as you feel comfortable. Name, address, you know the drill.

MR. STEPHENS: Yeah. I'm Jesse Stephens; Crockett Engineer, 1000 West Nifong. And I do have a PowerPoint here. I don't know --

MR. ZENNER: They'll turn it on the back.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: Unless you -- did you preload it?

MR. STEPHENS: It's pulled up here on the -- on the laptop.

MR. ZENNER: There it goes.

MR. STEPHENS: Okay. All right. Thank you all for letting me come up and speak. So I'm with Crockett Engineering. We're representing P1316, LLC, which is the applicant, and we're calling this Discovery Hotel. So -- so I think Clint did a pretty good job of kind of explaining all this. But just so you know, the site is located adjacent to Park Restaurant and the Townplace Suite Marriott. Our site is basically south -- to the southeast of that fronting Highway 63. The desire for the location is kind of a

synergy between the two hotels and Park Restaurant, and that's basically the decision-making factor on why we wanted here. So two tracts, they're both approximately two acres in size. The Lot 1 request is for a four-story hotel, which is the model that the franchise would be is a true hotel, which is a Hilton brand. Lot 2, you -- as Clint pointed out, there will be a future PD plan that will address that. There's been a lot of discussion about what that might be but hoping to be something that synergistic with this hotel-restaurant concept. So here's the overview of it. As Clint said, we're dealing with some pretty -- the thought process on the tract and zoning split lines didn't really hold out true with the road pattern, so we just deal with that as we come into it. We -- we thought it was more appropriate to go all PD than try to stick with the M-C due to the -- due to the height restrictions. The pattern will flow all the way around the parking on all sides of the building. And this connector thread, it will be a private connector thread that connects between the round-about and Ponderosa. So the elevation, just one thing I'll point out. The actual picture that you see up there is the St. Charles Tru Hotel. Caveat, that is actually a five-story hotel. We are not -- what we're proposing is not five-story, but four-story. But that's the closest thing to this area that's been built. That's -- that's the look in the -- of what you're -- what we're proposing so -- there's a little bit bigger picture of it, so something that looks nice and attractive. The developer has been committed to brick stone materials out in that area, just due to the simple fact that not -- these are not final designs, and there is some franchise agreements that there needs to be a little bit of flexibility for building materials, although I highly suspect you're going to see a lot more brick and stone and durable materials than the minimum, so -- and with that, I'll be happy to answer any questions.

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

MS. CARROLL: Will this hotel have conference rooms?

MR. STEPHENS: Interesting -- there will be probably a small -- I guess, part of the franchise agreement, it was required to have some meeting space in there. But actually part of the concepts that have been floating around for this Lot 2 is something of that nature, more of a something that would pull from both hotels, more of a conference-type area. So that -- nothing is final there, but that's been discussed.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Anyone else wish to speak on this case tonight? Seeing none.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments? Seeing none. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Quick question for legal. Ms. Thompson, we want two motions here?

MS. THOMPSON: That's correct.

MR. MACMANN: And do you want the zoning first and then the amendment?

MS. THOMPSON: I think that would be most appropriate, yes.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you. In the matter -- oops. In the matter of Case 69-2023, approval of the rezoning of the property from M-C to PD, I move to approve.

MS. KIMBELL: Second it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Seconded -- or moved by Commissioner MacMann; seconded by Commissioner Kimbell. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 8-0.**

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, that recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Are there any other motions on this case? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. In the matter of 69-2023, approval of the major amendment to the PD Plan for Discovery Hotel as laid out in the staff notes, the Discovery Hotel PD Plan, I move to approve.

MS. KIMBELL: I'll second it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann; seconded by Commissioner Kimbell. Is there any Commission discussion on the motion? Seeing -- sorry. Commissioner Carroll, go ahead.

MS. CARROLL: I'll make a brief comment on this one.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Love to.

MS. CARROLL: I've been critical of these in the past with PD Plan amendments and contribution to urban sprawl. I do see that we have quite a bit out there now. I do see that this appears to support the neighboring uses, and the neighbor -- the surrounding uses across 63. I think that may work out to benefit what is currently there.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 8-0.**

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. That ends our scheduled cases for the night.