

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
JANUARY 5, 2017

Case No. 17-34

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants on behalf of Burlington Vandiver, LLC (owner) for approval of a C-P (Planned Business District) development plan known as "CenterPointe Hospital of Columbia C-P Plan". The 12.1-acre subject site is located on the northeast corner of Rangeline Street and International Drive.

MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Steve MacIntyre of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the C-P development plan and Design Parameters, subject to Public Works Director waiver of the required traffic study requirement identified in the 2001 ordinance which rezoned the subject site to C-P.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacIntyre. Commissioners, any questions of staff? Mr. MacIntyre, can you kind of -- it looks like access, these are right-in/right outs out along Rangeline and then a full access off of International Drive; is that correct?

MR. MACINTYRE: That's correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: And International Drive and Rangeline today does not have a signalized intersection. Correct?

MR. MACINTYRE: Correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: And based on that then, City traffic engineers do not believe that that's necessary to address at this point?

MR. MACINTYRE: That's correct. The nature of the use is relatively low traffic impacts associated with it, whereas as if it were a larger -- say a 50,000 square foot retail facility, I think that might change the situation. So --

MR. STRODTMAN: And this is a traditional hospital, if there is such a thing?

MR. MACINTYRE: I'll have the applicant speak on that, but my understanding from a basic Google search is that it's a behavioral health facility, so they do treatments of psychological disorders and dispense medications. There's some --

MR. STRODTMAN: Something that has to have approval from the State?

MR. MACINTYRE: I believe so, yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. MacIntyre. Commissioners, any additional questions of staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you very much for following up on that, Mr. Chairman. If this is an approved facility, do you know if they have that? They need a certification if --

MR. MACINTYRE: I would need the applicant to verify that.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I'll wait till then. Thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: The suspense is going to kill you, isn't it?

MR. MACMANN: It is. It's tearing me up.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? I see none. This is a public hearing, so we'll go ahead and open it to the public. We just ask for your name and address and each speaker will have three minutes.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. And Mr. MacMann, I'm sorry I'm going to disappoint because I have -- I do not have the answers to your questions, either, so you have to wait just a tad bit longer, and I apologize. With me tonight is Travis Parker; he's with Johnson, Johnson, Crabtree. He's the architect for the project, as well as we have some representatives from the owner as well who can speak to that -- to that record. I would like to start off by saying this -- this C-P plan was submitted by and completed by Ingram Engineering, who is a topnotch engineering -- civil engineering firm out of Brentwood, Tennessee. I'm acting on their behalf as a consultant for them tonight, as well as the project in general, so I worked with them for several months getting this project through the process. Again, the current zoning of the property is C-P. It's a little over 12 acres in size, a single-story facility with about 156 parking spaces. It's at the access -- it has access from International Drive and 763 and, again, over 60 percent of the site is in green space. The one issue that was brought up was -- Mr. MacIntyre did a good job of explaining it -- was with regard to the traffic impact study. When this whole property was zoned several years ago, none of the infrastructure was in place. I don't believe 763 was improved, International Drive was not installed. I believe there as very little infrastructure with regard to roadway network had been installed in this area. So the provision was put on all these tracts that as each tract came through, a traffic study would need to be completed. In this case, it's been several -- several years since that took place, and a lot of roadway infrastructure has taken place. International Drive is a fully improved local nonresidential street, as well as 763. So that's the reason for the variance, and I believe that's the reason why the staff is in agreement that we don't need a traffic impact study for this use. This piece of property had a previous C-P plan approved, and I believe that the Commission will remember several years ago Columbia Safety, which was an industrial type and retail user, had a lot of larger trucks and a lot of additional traffic during the day, was approved on this site and, again, they got a waiver for the traffic impact study, as well. We anticipate substantially less traffic on this site. Again, the C-P plan, again, the right-in/right-out, that is being permitted by MoDOT. MoDOT has been contacted and they're in agreement that a right-in/right-out is acceptable at that location. The City traffic engineers agree and concur with that assessment, as well. The other access will again be off International Drive for the property. It's a pretty straightforward request, we believe. Here's a couple just real just basic architectural renderings of the site. They kind of illustrates the modern building style that they're -- that they're promoting here. And we believe it's a great facility for this location, for this area. It's -- you know, it's shielded from the residential residences in the

area. There is some multi-family right behind us, but there's a substantial amount of screening between us and the multi-family, and then, of course, the single-family further out than that. So with that, I'll be happy to answer any questions. Again, Travis Parker with the architect is here, as well as some owner representatives to answer the question with regard to permitting through the State.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioner -- oh. All the hands are up. We'll start in front. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Crockett, this relates back to certificate of need, so maybe it needs more information, but I noticed on the C-P plan that the parking identifies 76 spaces, but the certificate of need application for this project identified 72 beds. So I'm just -- has there been a change? Are we looking at the same project or --

MR. CROCKETT: I'd let the owner refer to that.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: We have substantially more beds just based on the need of the -- of the number of spaces that we need, so our -- our spaces that we're proposing exceed the 72 or 76 based on prior project that they have and simply the need that they're going need. So we exceed both of those, but I have -- make -- as to proper --

MS. LOE: Right. No. I agree that parking overall exceeds, it was just how many beds are we talking about at this facility.

MR. CROCKETT: Right. We'll let -- we'll let the representatives answer that specific question for you.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: I apologize.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe, okay? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: Is this an inpatient and an outpatient facility?

MR. CROCKETT: With regards to the type of facilities, again, I'll let the owners representatives talk. I think I know, but I won't talk intelligently, so I'll let the folks that have the answer for you, Ms. Russell, answer that question. I apologize.

MR. STRODTMAN: Knocking them down quick.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah, I know.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I'm going to wait for the owner's rep.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you. I -- I will sit down because I have no answers.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions for this speaker? Mr. Crockett, thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional speakers -- owner representatives, architects, anyone?

MR. PARKER: Hi. My name is Travis Parker; I'm an architect with Johnson Johnson Crabtree Architects. Speaking to the CON process, we have been granted a CON by the State. We plan to execute on that CON for a 72-bed facility in 55,000 square feet on this site. The parking that I believe

that you addressed earlier was -- we were required to have somewhere around 66 -- or sorry -- 70 spaces for this facility. We are, I think, doing 168 spaces.

MS. LOE: It's just the sheet identifies it. It's doing spaces for 76 beds, so there seems to be an incongruous or disconnect between the CON and the drawings. So you're confirming that it's a 72-bed facility?

MR. PARKER: Yes.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: Inpatient and outpatient?

MR. PARKER: Inpatient and outpatient.

MS. RUSSELL: Is there an involuntary unit in this facility?

MR. PARKER: No. This is all voluntary.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay. Okay. And is there some common ground outdoor activity area set aside?

MR. PARKER: Yes. Yes, ma'am.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I believe my questions have currently been answered. Thank you.

MR. PARKER: Love it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions for this speaker?

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: If I may ask, is there a possibility that the certificate of need may be increased to include 76 beds?

MR. PARKER: At this current moment, 72 is all that they have granted us.

MS. LOE: That's all that was applied for.

MR. ZENNER: And occasionally --

MS. LOE: But I'm not aware of the State involuntarily increasing that number, yes.

MR. ZENNER: Occasionally, and the reason I ask that -- occasionally, we do have applications and authorizations that vary from what is shown on the plan --

MR. PARKER: Uh-huh.

MR. ZENNER: -- and that is normally a standard practice that we generally deal with especially as it relates to square footage of a structure. They were approved only for 55,000 square feet. This is a 56,000 square foot, unless it shows 55 on the plan, we always normally incorporate some level of expansion in case there is variation in the plan set to avoid the need to come back for a major amendment. That is the reason I asked the question. However, their certificate of need is going to

determine how many beds they can have and that could be easily corrected on the site plan. That was the reason for my question.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: As far as you know, are there any plans to include an involuntary unit in this facility?

MR. PARKER: No, ma'am.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Just for clarification, sir, is it no, that you're not aware of any plans, or no that they're -- they're not going to do that?

MS. RUSSELL: He said --

MR. PARKER: They are not planning to do any.

MR. STRODTMAN: They are not planning on it. Mr. MacMann, did you have a question?

MR. MACMANN: Just a question on certificate of need. And you may know this and I don't know. How much can you expand? I see there's 1,000 extra square feet in there. How much can you expand before you have to amend your certificate of need with the State; do you know?

MR. PARKER: I think that you would have to amend the certificate of need before you do -- prior to the expansion or prior to the licensure of --

MR. MACMANN: Prior to the licensure. How long is that process; do you know?

MR. PARKER: I could not speak to that.

MR. MACMANN: I just wondered if there was a normal lag time. That's all. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions for this speaker? Thank you, Mr. Parker.

MR. PARKER: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone else like -- wishing to speak on this matter? I see none. We'll go ahead and close the public portion of this case, Case 17-34.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, discussion, questions, comments? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I'll do a motion.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. RUSSELL: In regards to Case 17-34, I move to approve the C-P development plan and design parameters subject to the Public Works Director waiver of the required traffic study requirement identified in the 2001 ordinance which rezoned the subject site to C-P.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. A motion has been made by Ms. Russell and has been seconded by Ms. Rushing. Is there comments, discussion on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey.
Motion carries 9-0.

MS. BURNS: Motion carries 9-0.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Chairman, five minutes?

MR. STRODTMAN: We were going to try to maybe go through one more.

MR. ZENNER: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: Is everybody good with that? Yeah. Moving on. At this time, I would ask any Commissioners who have had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 17-23, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just FYI, and I think you all caught the gist of it, but just to be clear. Ms. Fleischmann contacted me with a question she was going to pose to Mr. Zenner, which I passed that question along to him. The question was regarding what happens if an existing property burns down, and Mr. Zenner was going to answer that question. And that's the contact, I had and you guys were present when I got that.

MR. STRODTMAN: So the question was what would happen if a property was --

MR. MACMANN: A current structure were to burn and be completely destroyed.

MR. STRODTMAN: So a natural disaster?

MR. MACMANN: Correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional, Commissioners? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: We received -- a couple of us received a communication from Ms. Fowler, which I forwarded to Mr. Zenner, but I believe it came -- it was today, so it's not something that was shared with all the Commission. I didn't have time to read it all myself, but I believe it was regarding this case.

MR. ZENNER: There are additional -- there is distribution of material that we did receive today as it relates not only to --

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: -- this pending request, as well as the next request for the UDC, and Ms. Fowler's comments are incorporated into those that are related to the UDC. And in essence and summary, they have to deal with she is supporting -- asking that you support the request to downzone these 35 properties as a means of preserving the neighborhood character of this particular and unique area.

MR. STRODTMAN: For the Commissioners, I also received that e-mail from Ms. Loe, and it is attached in your packet. It's the stapled page and it's the very last page of that stapled document from Pat Fowler, 606 North Sixth Street, so you do have it in your packet, as well as the other two that are specifically related to this case. Any additional items, Commissioners?