

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

APRIL 6, 2017

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

**Mr. Rusty Strodtman
Ms. Tootie Burns
Ms. Sara Loe
Ms. Lee Russell
Ms. Joy Rushing
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Mr. Brian Toohey
Mr. Michael MacMann**

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Mr. Dan Harder

I) CALL TO ORDER

MR. STRODTMAN: Good evening. We'll go ahead and get started. Welcome to the City of Columbia Planning and Zoning Commission meeting of April 6, 2017. I'd like to call the meeting to order. May I have a roll call, please?

MS. TOOTIE: Yes. We have eight; we have a quorum.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns.

II) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. STRODTMAN: Any changes to the agenda, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: No changes to the agenda, sir, but we will have a little bit of a conversation under Comments of Staff as it relates to Item C from your work session agenda.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

III) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, we received the March 23rd notes from our March 23rd regular meeting. Are there any corrections or modifications needed to those minutes? I see none. Are we all good with that on the minutes? Thumbs up, everyone. All thumbs up that approve.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Thank you.

IV) PUBLIC HEARINGS

MR. STRODTMAN: Moving on. First and only public hearing.

Case No. 17-87

A request by Columbia College for approval of an updated campus master plan. The campus is approximately 36 acres, and lies primarily in an area bounded by Wilkes Boulevard, Rogers Street, Seventh Street and Fay Street.

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

MS. RUSSELL: Mr. -- Mr. Chairman, could I mention that I have -- my husband is on leave of

absence from the Board of Trustees for Columbia College, and I have a personal relationship with the president and his wife, but I have not discussed any of this with him.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you for that information. Any other information from the Commissioners related to this case? Thank you.

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the updated Columbia College Campus Master Plan dated January 2017.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Commissioners, any questions for staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Palmer, thank you for your presentation. I have two areas of questions and if Cliff needs to answer those later, I'll ask him at that time.

MR. PALMER: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: Particularly in regards to the proposed parking on Alton Street, yes, that house needs to come down. Will the ingress and egress on the Alton parking -- potential parking at 802 Alton be back in Practice Hall lot or will that discharge and so on onto Alton itself?

MR. PALMER: At this time, I -- I wouldn't know. I would -- I would picture it as an expansion of the existing parking, so I know --

MR. MACMANN: The existing parking, it has both options. Actually, the parking is bifurcated, but I'll ask -- I'll ask Cliff if it comes up.

MR. PALMER: Okay. Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: And something else I notice, well, I see it on the master plan and they've been really good about presenting that when they did their North Central presentation. They have outlier properties which are currently held as residential units. Are those part and parcel of the master plan also?

MR. PALMER: They're not on this master plan and they're not adjacent to it, and the applicant has indicated that there's no -- no -- long-range plan for those properties. They're just maintaining them as rental properties at this time.

MR. MACMANN: And I appreciate that. Will there -- is there some sort of trigger whereby they would have to be included in the master plan?

MR. ZENNER: The master plan, one of the purposes of the master plan as it exists within the UDC is to allow campus expansion to occur outside of the general zoning requirements. As Mr. Palmer pointed out, institutions of higher education can be in any zoning district in the code subject to the master plan approval, with the exception of MU which doesn't have a master plan since they're an entity of the State. Properties that the University or the college may hold that are outside of their campus master plan are not given the same level of exemption that a proposed building inside the campus master plan's boundaries would be given if it does -- if the improvements don't comply with the zoning requirements in the underlying district. So as long as the property is intended to be used -- the property lying outside of the campus master plan is intended to be used in accordance with the underlying zoning, there is no requirement for them to have to absorb it into the campus master plan. It would only be at some point that that building may be used in a fashion that would be noncompliant with the underlying zoning; for instance,

taking an RMF zoned parcel that's being used as multifamily and wanting that to be converted potentially into classroom or academic teaching space. That would be something that would not be a permissible use in the RMF. You would have to actually rezone that to an OMF district, the office district, or you could incorporate it into the campus master plan as amended at that point if you were trying to be able to do that type of use variance, in essence. I think, as was expressed in 2013 when the plan came forward with the maintenance facilities north of Wilkes, part of our review at the Commission and at the Council level of the campus master plan is to look at those potential land use conflicts that may be created, identify those and point them out, and then allow the opportunity for the public process to be able to work either those out of the campus boundary if they would create a noncontiguous tracts, for example, or to at least publicly acknowledge that that type of use variation would be being considered appropriate. Use variances by nature are not permitted under the zoning ordinance. The Board of Adjustment cannot approve a use variance. So the fact that it would be included under a campus master plan potentially would be a method by which to avoid a Board of Adjustment action thereby creating that nonpermitted use variance discussion. But at this point, we have nothing in the Code that's a trigger to say expand your master plan to include a noncontiguous properties or holdings that you have at a threshold. I think that will have to be -- the inclusion of these properties would be borne out based upon possibly future campus growth and potentially other property acquisition that would be within the area.

MR. MACMANN: So just to clarify -- and thank you for that. Use seems to be the determining -- any use change. They own -- they own some residential. That's fine, that's awesome, that's outside the plan.

MR. ZENNER: Only if they continue to use it by the zoning designation and the uses allowed, they would be able to continue to do that. Renovation, improvements to the property, in accordance to the new zoning classifications, neighborhood protection standards, and all the other requirements now which -- they would be subject to that.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you.

MR. PALMER: And you'll note on this plan that they actually -- they call out the similar properties that are more compact with the central campus, so I think there's an effort there to show that -- that those are there. It's just a matter of the use being a residential single-family home or whatever.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any other additional questions, Commissioners? I see none. We'll go ahead and open this up. It is a public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: If there is anyone in the audience who would like to come forward and give us some information, we would please you to do that at this time. Just give us your name and address and it is -- the floor is yours.

MR. JARVIS: Thank you. Good evening. Cliff Jarvis, representing Columbia College, 1001 Rogers Street, Columbia, Missouri. The staff report was really -- covered most of if not everything that I had to present this evening. I have no formal presentation. There were some significant changes from the 2013 master plan. They were spelled out in the report, so I think that that's covered, but I can answer

any questions about that, and any questions that you might have that haven't been answered already by staff. So I'm just free to answer questions.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Jarvis. Commissioners, speakers for Mr. Jarvis -- or speakers. Questions for Mr. Jarvis? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I just had one to follow up on the question I asked Mr. Palmer. I know the buildings -- you're not there, but do you know. 802 Alton, do you plan to discharge into Practice Hall's parking lot or out onto Alton, or do you know?

MR. JARVIS: It's -- we're really early in the thought concept process on that project, but it's likely going to be made contiguous with the Practice Hall parking lot and exit out onto Eighth Street -- yeah, Eighth or Seventh.

MR. MACMANN: Yes. Eighth Street. Yeah.

MR. JARVIS: Eighth Street, not onto to Alton.

MR. MACMANN: I was going to say, wow, you bought an alley, Cliff.

MR. JARVIS: The existing alley -- the existing driveway is too steep to come out on that.

MR. MACMANN: All right. All right. That's why I was asking that very question.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? I have one, Mr. Jarvis. How do you vet the plan to the neighborhood themselves? Do you do any kind of campus master plan updating with the neighborhood? Just curious.

MR. JARVIS: We -- we held a neighborhood meeting with the North Center.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay.

MR. JARVIS: Very well attended and I presented this -- this plan to them. Received comments, answered questions. That was the extent of that.

MR. STRODTMAN: Got you. So you kind of did it the same process you're doing it with the P & Z and the City? The same --

MR. JARVIS: That's correct. That's correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: Every three years or four years?

MR. JARVIS: That's correct. The -- so the previous -- if I may just a moment on previous master plan, the requirements of the ordinance don't -- don't include all of the information that we provided in the past. It was a lot more detailed than a 40-page, 60-page document. That had a lot more information about programming and cost information and very forward looking and very detailed information. This -- this current -- so -- but the ordinance requires a development plan -- updated development plan, which is what we're proposing this evening. It really just shows a conceptual proposed future, maybe we're going to build something here and there, things that are identified that may over the next half dozen years may happen. If, in the future, a project comes up that's not included on the plan, we'll update the plan and come back and start the process over.

MR. STRODTMAN: So your thought is the potential six-story academic and residential hall is -- has potential within the next five years, six years maybe of being developed?

MR. JARVIS: That's correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: Since it's on the plan?

MR. JARVIS: That's correct. And let me say one thing about the six-story piece of that. When we first started contemplating that project, we weren't sure exactly what the footprint was going to be. We have a lot -- we have geothermal wells all over that part of campus. We weren't sure how -- what the footprint could be. So we knew how many beds we wanted to add, and we didn't know how big we could -- what the -- how we were going to touch the ground. So we said six is what we want to go with. Six seemed like a reasonable number. It's unlikely to be that -- be that six stories now that we're -- we made some changes.

MR. STRODTMAN: And that wasn't the specific question as much as just the thought that that's a potential that's going to come. It's more likely to occur than not.

MR. JARVIS: I certainly hope so. I certainly hope that attendance at that time will continue to increase and we're able to --

MR. STRODTMAN: Are you -- is that -- is that the forecast is that your enrollment will continue to increase like it has the last three to five years?

MR. JARVIS: We're looking -- yeah. So we had -- we had a significant increase this academic year, and one data point doesn't make a trend, but we feel that it's the trend with that Columbia College is a great place to go to school. So we're -- we are encouraged by response from recruits and prospects and reaching out all across the state and outside the state, and feel like we're getting a good response to that, so we feel that there's going to be a need for more space.

MR. STRODTMAN: Well, coming from the business community, I appreciate the growth, and we appreciate our campuses growing in Columbia. And my last question is, do you -- do you foresee the softball component coming back in the near future or is it -- because that was -- in '13, that was a major component of it was the softball --

MR. JARVIS: Was and -- and it -- being able to fit that facility into that space was -- was going to be very tight. We have since 2013 -- matter of fact, just this last year entered into a long-term agreement with the City of Columbia to use Antimi Field out at Cosmo Park ten years. So that -- there's -- the need for a softball field on campus is now out ten years, so if that --

MR. STRODTMAN: You're playing the softball, just not using your -- your facility?

MR. JARVIS: That -- that's correct. So if -- when the need comes back up, we'll -- we'll come back to this Commission and ask for -- to update another one.

MR. STRODTMAN: My last plug is your E sport competition is Saturday, so if you're into eSports -- so one of the few colleges in the United States giving scholarships to eSport student athletes.

MR. JARVIS: That is correct. We're expecting a big crowd.

MR. STRODTMAN: My -- I'll be there with my kids, so --

MR. JARVIS: Excellent.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? Thank you, Mr. Jarvis. Are there any other speakers in the audience that would like to come forward? I see none. We'll go ahead and close this public case 17-87.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, discussion, comments? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just to follow up on what Mr. Jarvis said, this is a little disclosure. I was present at North Central when Mr. Jarvis presented, and I just wanted to say that the neighborhood was overwhelmingly positive to his presentation. They appreciated the outreach and the chance to give input.

MR. STRODTMAN: It's nice to hear that, Mr. MacMann. I thank you for giving us that information because, obviously, there are very -- that would be the 900-pound gorilla for that neighborhood, so it's nice that they were heard.

MR. MACMANN: That -- I will say this at this time that building was mentioned, its use was mentioned. The only thing that wasn't mentioned was the height at that time. I don't recall if that question was asked. I don't think it was asked. I don't think he even knew at that juncture. The use -- I will say this. My take as a hopefully disinterested observer there, the use and location of the building is fine. It's right in the middle of campus, so it's not abutting residential or anything.

MR. STRODTMAN: I would think it's probably in one of the best locations that you could pick based on what they have to pick from. Additional comments, Commissioners? Any additional information needed? Motion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 17-87, Columbia College Campus Master Plan update, I move to approve the update to Columbia College Campus Master plan.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. TOOHEY: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll -- yeah, I'll pick between that. Thank you, Mr. Stanton for that motion, and Ms. -- Joy, sorry. Thank you for that second. Any additional discussion needed on this motion, Commissioners? I see none, Ms. Burns, when you're ready for a roll call.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero. Motion is approved.

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

V) COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone from the public who would like to come forward, you're welcome to at this point.

(There were no comments from the public.)

VI) COMMENTS OF THE STAFF

MR. ZENNER: Well --

MR. STRODTMAN: We're assuming, Mr. Zenner, you've got something that you would like to go

over with us.

MR. ZENNER: I'll limber my thumbs up first. We have a meeting on April 20th. That will be your next work session, as well as a regularly scheduled meeting. The work session will be being held in conference 1C, which is herein the corridor. We were asked to relocate from 1B due to a need for both 1A and 1B, where we normally meet, so the meeting will still start at 5:30, and that will be on your agendas when they come out the Friday prior to the 20th's meeting. It will be another short meeting. We maybe jinxed ourselves on that, but we only have three subdivision-related items. There are no public hearings scheduled. One for Creek's Edge, Plat 1B. This is a subdivision down off of South Scott Boulevard. The Vineyards, Preliminary Plat 3. This is up off of WW and Rolling Hills near the new Vineyards Elementary School. And then The Gates Preliminary Plat Number 3, and this is down off of Old Plank Road and Route K. So you all are familiar with where we are talking about, the Creek's Edge plat is really a replat of some of the common area out at -- sorry -- at Creek's Edge out there. We'll be readjusting some of the back property lines of the parcels that are just inside the red boundary on the right-hand side or left-hand side of that image to be transferring over some common land to about four or five of the lots. The Vineyards plat, this is on the north side of the creek adjacent basically to our access road to the Elks Lodge, Elk Park Drive, and then just to the east of the City's acquired lake there that's on the north side of the creek, as well. And then, of course, The Gates, which you are familiar with. This is down off of Old Plank Road. This is an entire redo of the preliminary plat. The preliminary plat was -- redid the preliminary plat by eradicating or eliminating original subdivision final plat approval and then replatting the first couple of phases of The Gates, and then the preliminary plat for the remainder of The Gates acreage came in included significant land areas that were in common lots. And as you are aware, we have brought may plats back before you that are cutting away at the common-lot acreage within the project based upon the developer's negotiations with property purchasers. In order to avoid that very laborious process of elimination of common lots and potentially marketing a project to the public with land areas that may not be what they are shown as on the preliminary, the preliminary plat is being presented to eliminate the majority of the common area within the project with the exception of areas that are necessary in order to supply or support storm water drainage. This is -- it's zoned R-1. It is a permissible use to not have common area. It is not a requirement of our zoning code. That does not necessarily mean, however, that as final plats are brought in, that common area will not be created. What Mr. Tompkins would like to have is the greatest level of flexibility to market and convey property to his clientele that include the woods that were previously identified on the preliminary as a common lot. Changes within the UDC will not allow particular transactions to occur as an administrative action between common areas that are unplatted and other platted property, so this is a way of being able to, in essence, reset the development plan to ensure that the transactions that will be occurring are in accordance with our regulatory procedure. As with any revision to a preliminary plan, it is not a guarantee that that preliminary plat may be approved, and that is, obviously, once the presentation is made, you will have the ability to make recommendation on that, and then Council, obviously, would have a final say as to the approval of the preliminary plat or not. What I can tell you is, again, and I will reiterate and will reiterate during the actual staff report, common land

dedication is not a requirement in straight zoned subdivisions. It was done at the request of the developer with his engineer when the original preliminary was approved as a method of what was then considered undevelopable property and maybe unwanted by the general public. What Mr. Tompkins has found as he has gone through his development vetting with potential customers is they actually want the woods on their land, and we will have an opinion to that as a staff in the staff report, as well. So more to come on that, but that is what this is about. This is a replat of the entire Gates subdivision of the unplatted property. It's a reapproval of its preliminary. We do have about five or six additional phases of development out here that have not yet been platted, and we have the first three phases -- three or four phases of platting already accomplished. But that will be your last item on the main agenda for the Planning and Zoning Commission. And we are working on several items that will be on your May agenda that are more substantive as they relate to annexation issues and development-related matters where just some of our -- some of the details associated with those projects have resulted in some delays with what was originally anticipated. Hence, the reason for the lack of any public hearing items on this particular agenda. And as I had indicated at the beginning of the meeting, we had an Item C that was on work session agenda that I mentioned during the opening of our work session dealing with the 2018 Capital Improvement Plan and the general overview of that document. If you have not clicked on the link that was on the online agenda that takes you to the staff report, within the staff report is the link -- the electronic link to the Capital Improvement Plan for FY2018. As we discussed in work session this evening with Item A, which was talking about our 2016 through 2019 Strategic Plan, there were several connections that were made between possible capital improvement projects within the three strategic plan areas that are identified within the CIP that may be worthy of consideration as we hear reports from our standard bearers of CIP information. Our Public Works Department which will cover street, and Public Works related improvements. We will have our Utilities Department present, which covers our water, our electric, our sewer. And then we ask that our Parks and Recreation staff also attend to provide an overview of their projects within the CIP, as well as what they have in the pipeline. Parks and Recreation, obviously, is always the highlight of these meetings given with the park sales tax and other things that they have in the pipeline for improvement, and many of those projects actually will be forthcoming to the Commission here this year as it relates to some capital improvement sales tax projects that we have done concept reviews on. Our -- our Public Works staff may be able to help provide some analysis as it relates to street and sidewalk projects. As Ms. Christian conveyed this evening tonight in work session as related to the capital -- the Strategic Plan, some of those projects may be in the year within the CIP plan that may need to be considered as possible adjustments given trying to facilitate goals and objectives of the strategic planning process, but that, again, the information was presented this evening for you -- for your knowledge and for your consideration as a way of being able to tie our community needs to our capital budgeting process itself. And then, likewise, we'll have our Water and Light and our Utilities staff, which deal with our storm water and our sanitary sewer side of City operations available to present what their projects are as it relates to the utility needs for the City and how those capital projects may influence future development and growth within particular locations within the community. As we have previously

discussed with the Commission year to year when we do these meetings on the Capital Improvement Program, they are required under the statutory requirements of the Planning and Zoning Commission and under City Code. It is your responsibility to provide a recommendation to City Council as it relates to the CIP. In meeting that requirement, we have been asked by our finance department in preparation for the Council's budget retreat, which will be in May, to ensure that the actual comments of the Commission are received by our finance department by May 12th, meaning that at the May 4th work session, a formulation of the recommendation of the Commission based upon your consideration of the presentations by our three departments, as well as your personal review of the Code, of the CIP, we'll need to formulate into a memorandum format that I then can forward to the finance department on behalf of the Commission by the 12th, which is the Friday following your May 4 meeting. Unless you have any additional direction that you would like or any additional department that you would like me to ask to attend the April 20th meeting, I will proceed as I have in prior years and invite our standard folks from each of the respective departments to give presentation.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, do you foresee any additional speakers needed? Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

MR. ZENNER: With that, that is all we have to offer for staff this evening, and I thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: As always, we appreciate you, Mr. Zenner.

VII) COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, comments?

VIII) ADJOURNMENT

MR. STRODTMAN: Motion? Mr. Stanton? Mr. Stanton, hey, I didn't notice your hand was up. Sorry.

MR. STANTON: I move to adjourn.

MR. STRODTMAN: Well, thank you, Mr. Stanton. Do we have a second?

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. TOOHEY: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Russell. We are adjourned.

(Off the record.)

(The meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m.)