

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
AUGUST 10, 2017

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Mr. Rusty Strodman
Ms. Tootie Burns
Ms. Sara Loe
Ms. Lee Russell
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Mr. Dan Harder
Ms. Joy Rushing
Mr. Brian Toohey
Mr. Michael MacMann

I) CALL TO ORDER

MR. STRODTMAN: Good evening, and welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission's Thursday, August 10, 2017, regular meeting. I'd like to call that meeting to order. May I have a roll call, please, Ms. Burns.

MS. BURNS: Yes. We are all here. We have nine. We have a quorum.

MR. STRODTMAN: Full house. We appreciate it. No vacations this time of year.

II) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, sir.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Appreciate that.

III) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. STRODTMAN: July 20, 2017. Are there any corrections or notations needed in those minutes? If I -- I guess I'll just do a thumbs up. I was -- if you weren't there. Thumbs up for approval.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. STRODTMAN: And we have all thumbs up.

IV) TABLING REQUESTS

Case No. 17-169

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of G&L Holdings of Missouri (owner), for approval of a PD Plan to be known as "Tower Drive Industrial Park PD Plan" and a design adjustment to allow a longer stem for a driveway to proposed Lot 3B. The subject 11-acre lot is located at the terminus of Tower Drive, north of Prathersville Road.

MR. STRODTMAN: Could we have a staff report on this tabling request?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, you can, Mr. Chairman. The applicant is seeking to have the item tabled until the August 24th meeting to allow us to continue to explore some additional regulatory issues that we are trying to work through with the UDC. You will note that you read that there was a design adjustment that was required with this particular application. That is something that we are still working through at this point to determine if that is actually a necessity or not and, therefore, we are -- the applicant has asked to have the item held off for us to be able to make that decision before we have to. This particular proposal, obviously, will have a plat that is accompanying with it, so trying to ensure that the PD plan is done properly up front is essential to determine what the path is of that final plat that will follow, and inferring that we have addressed all of the other outstanding issues that the plan may have. The staff supports the request to table and we will bringing the item back to you on the 24th.

MR. STRODTMAN: My only question, Mr. Zenner, but thank you for that report. Is this the first request of this?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, it is, sir.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Thank you. It's not a public hearing. If there is anybody in this audience that for some reason would like to come forward and give us some information. Obviously, if you're here to speak for or against the project, you will have a chance later on August 24th to come back. If you're available, we suggest you're -- you can send it to us -- Mr. Zenner, or you're welcome to come forward now and speak. But, if not -- if there's anybody in the audience that would like to come forward, you could at this point. You don't have to. Thank you. Commissioners, any questions? A motion? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: In the case of -- sorry, I was looking on -- 17-169, Tower Drive Industrial Park, move to table to the August 24th meeting.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe, for that motion, and, Mr. MacMann, thank you for that second. Commissioners, we have a motion on the table and it has a proper second. Is there any discussion needed? 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. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder. Motion carries 9-0.

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

V) SUBDIVISIONS

MR. STRODTMAN: Moving on to our first subdivision.

Case No. 17-167

A request by Allstate Consultants, LLC (agent) on behalf of Arrowhead 3, LLC (owner) for approval of a four-lot final plat on R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) zoned land, to be known as

"Arrowhead Lake Estates Plat 3", pending annexation and rezoning, and a design adjustment related to sensitive areas. The 26.72-acre subject site is located approximately 1,200 feet north of Sinclair Road on the east side of West Lake Arrowhead Drive.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the final plat for Arrowhead Lake Estates Plat 3 and the requested design adjustment.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Commissioners, earlier on, I forgot. If there has been any -- actually, we'll move up. Is there any questions for Mr. Smith, before I ask the next one? Yes?

MS. RUSHING: I have two questions. The lot that is just on the locator map below this area, it shows that leg coming out. Is that for access to the back part of that property?

MR. SMITH: This lot to the south?

MS. RUSHING: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: I didn't specifically evaluate that site, but, from my recollection, I do believe that's a stem lot. I think that's still located in the county.

MS. RUSHING: And would it be possible -- would the dedication of the property not to use, would that have to be four different lots or could that be done as one common lot?

MR. SMITH: Well, we looked at both options. I think when we originally had the initial discussion, the assumption would be it would be one large lot. The applicant, I think, leaned towards maybe four individual lots, so if you had four individual lots preservation area, then you would have eight total lots. I don't think there's any specific requirement that it be one way or the other.

MS. RUSHING: And how would you enforce in the future the preservation requirement?

MR. SMITH: Well, preservation enforcement is -- is -- is difficult. It would be, basically, a lot of these provisions are going to be complaint driven. I don't think we're going to be actively pursuing that. We don't necessarily have a preservation easement directive to go out and make sure these are being preserved, but we do -- if we go down this route with these preserved areas, it'll be something, I think, we'll take more note of. But I can't tell you if we have any certain procedure we're going to be following in the future. This is a fairly new provision of the -- of the subdivision. This is probably the first one that we actually -- I don't want to speak out of turn, but I think it's the first one that we have -- we'll have preservation easement on. There will be more in the future, but this is one of the first subdivisions we've come through that had that provision in the UDC in place.

MS. RUSHING: It just seems that it might be more -- you know, that's my property, whether there's a preservation easement, and I sell my property, I'm selling the whole thing, and it would just seem to be easy, particularly for a future owner, to forget about or not know about the preservation easement.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: To follow up on Commissioner Rushing's point -- good evening, Planner Smith.

Do you know when the individuals apply for building permits that the preservation easement will be obvious to them so they're not crossing these lines or –

MR. SMITH: When they apply for the building permit, my expectation -- again, we don't -- I don't think we've had a building permit come through that will have –

MR. MACMANN: This is one of the preliminary, so –

MR. SMITH: This is fairly new. I think my expectation here is that the building envelope will be reflected on their plot plan, and that should restrict where they –

MR. MACMANN: As long as that's -- my concern moving forward, so we just had this case a few months ago which exploded after 25 years, is that this is obvious when the property is transferred in the future, which it will be, or when it's built upon, hopefully legally, with a permit that should this paperwork reflecting these easements should be part and parcel and incredibly obvious.

MR. SMITH: I couldn't guarantee that. An easement, like many other documentation, is generally only reflected on a piece of paper, so it's up to the individual property owner to be knowledgeable about the restrictions on their own property. The City does have -- and I don't have it in front of me, but I -- I do believe they have provisions that would apply if someone removes trees within a preservation easement, aside from fencing it off or putting it under some type of permanent barrier, there probably is no way to be 100-percent certain that individuals –

MR. MACMANN: And that -- I -- I just want to let you know, I'm -- I think this is a great idea. This is fantastic. But because we are going forward for the first time with this, and because in the past we've had issues with this, I just want to make sure that we're heading in the right direction -- building permits, property transfers -- because we've had property transfers before where easements don't show up and then someone is not happy.

MR. SMITH: Easements that are recorded on the plats, such as this, as far as I know, should be reflected in any type of survey done by a professional licensed surveyor. So -- and this plat will be recorded and it will reflect the easement, too, but if you are a property owner, you may have your own survey done for your own property, and it still should be reflected on that, as well.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. SMITH: You're welcome.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Smith, question about building envelope. Being an architect, building envelope technically is the exterior of a building. And in checking the UDC, we haven't defined building envelope. What we have defined is building area, which is the area within a plot that a building may be built. I'm wondering if what we're talking -- what's referred to in these plots is not building area. And if not, can you clarify that for me?

MR. SMITH: It -- it could be, if you're talking, I think, from a purely literal sense. The Code for this section refers to a building envelope, and I think it kind of self-defines within that section. It's always better to have it in the definition of what a building envelope was and, again, I don't have it in front of me, I

can't tell you if it's in there specifically, but it does say in there that development should be restricted to a building envelope. So, to me, that implies that there will be no construction outside of basically the line that's reflected on that plat that is -- that is referred to as a building envelope.

MS. LOE: That's stated in the subdivision section of the UDC? No. I'll look for it.

MR. ZENNER: And I think, Ms. Loe, architectural terminology and terminology that we utilize generally --

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. ZENNER: -- is what Mr. Smith is trying to point to. We have referred to building envelope to generally mean that area upon a site which the building can be placed within, not building area. Building area --

MS. LOE: Buildable area.

MR. ZENNER: Buildable area --

MS. LOE: Buildable area. The area of the lot that buildings may occupy.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. And so in this particular provision where the standard is, we use it potentially more synonymously with building area, we use the term "building envelope." It's defining the envelope in which that building can reside within, which would be the same thing as building area.

MS. LOE: Buildable area.

MR. ZENNER: Buildable area, but not -- not by an architectural definition of what building envelope means. Our Code was not based upon an architect's perspective of how it was written. I apologize.

MS. LOE: I understand. It's simply we haven't defined that.

MR. SMITH: I could read the section real quick if it provides some additional clarity.

MS. LOE: That would be great.

MR. SMITH: It says, If any lot intended for development includes designated sensitive lands, the subdivision plat shall restrict construction of permanent structures to a designated building envelope area on that lot. So that way, it does kind of self-define within that section of the Code. So, basically, what we're showing graphically on there is the building envelope and there will be no construction outside of that.

MS. LOE: And the section is?

MR. SMITH: 29-5.1(b)(2), and let's just go with that, (b)(2).

MS. LOE: Thanks.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Any additional questions of staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: One quick clarification, because I do not recall. Can they go all the way up to the edge of this -- this building envelope? Can that building sit on the -- on that line?

MR. SMITH: It could, yes.

MR. MACMANN: Can --

MR. SMITH: Well, I would say that this is a good question.

MR. MACMANN: And, well, I'm going after this because I doubt anyone would do that, but what someone may do is run plumbing or sewage right up to that line --

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: -- and I just -- I don't recall. Mr. Zenner, do you recall?

MR. ZENNER: The setback will come, so either the variation here is is that easement that's defining the preservation area becomes by default the setback for the property. So we do have setback requirements for every residential -- or every lot that's created regardless of its designation. An easement, if the easement that's being established on a parcel is greater than what that required setback is, the easement boundary becomes the setback, which means, yes, you still can build directly up to that easement line. There is no offset from an easement.

MR. MACMANN: All right. It's its own buffer?

MR. ZENNER: It -- yeah. That's exactly --

MR. MACMANN: That's what I thought. That's what I recall, but I just was not sure.

MR. ZENNER: So if there was a desire to ensure that, as we move forward, potentially using preservation easements, not parcels, that we want the setback that's in the underlying zoning district to apply for that easement line to create a offset so there is a buffer, that would require separate text change at a later date.

MR. MACMANN: All right. You and I are getting in the weeds, and I really appreciate this, but these people have business to do. I am done. Thank you, Mr. Strodtman.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Commissioners, any additional questions for staff? I see none. This is not a public hearing, but if there's anyone in the audience that would like to come forward and give us any information on this case, you're welcome to do that, and just please give us your name and address.

MR. STATES: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is John States; I reside at 2925 West Arrowhead Lake Drive. I am a member of the LLC and here with me tonight is Mr. Doniphan, who is also a member of the LLC. We're here seeking approval of this four-lot subdivision. We've worked a lot of hours with City staff and we greatly appreciate your all's efforts on this. I think maybe somebody said being the first through with this has -- has been challenging, but we've made it, I think -- hopefully. We're here to answer any questions you might have, and look forward to --

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions of this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. States. Any additional speakers like to come forward? I see none. Thank you. Something I was supposed to probably read earlier, but, Commissioners, at this time, if there's -- has -- if there's any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communication prior to this time on this case, if you would please disclose it at this time, that would be appreciative and relevant. If not -- I see none. Commissioners, any discussion, additional information needed? A motion? Mr. Anthony -- Mr. Stanton, sorry.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 17-167, I move for approval of the final plat and design

adjustments.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Show that Mr. MacMann seconds? Do you -- yes. Thank you, Mr. Stanton, for that motion of approval of Case 17-167. Mr. MacMann, thank you for that second. Commissioners, the motion is on the table with the proper second. Is there any further discussion needed? I see none. Ms. Burns, whenever you're ready for a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

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

Case No. 17-178

A request by Brush and Associates (agent), on behalf of Christina and Jerold Wilson (owners), for approval of a two-lot minor subdivision to be known as "Northern Heights Plat 2-A", and design modifications related to sidewalk installation and right-of-way dedication requirements for residential streets. The 0.55 acres subject property is located at 2906 and 2908 Flora Drive.

MR. STRODTMAN: 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 "Northern Heights Plat 2-A" and the requested design modifications.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Commissioners, at this time, I would like to ask if there has been any ex parte communications prior to this time from any Commissioner, that you would disclose it at this time regarding this case. I see none. Is there any questions for staff related to Case 17-178? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a quickie. Mr. Palmer, the subdivision plat 2-A, the final plat, shows a private common collector coming through there and it goes through the yard of the southern house. Is there any difficulty with a sewer for the northern house -- the northeastern house? I'm assuming that's also on a private sewer?

MR. PALMER: I know there's the offsite easement that's down here that was --

MR. ZENNER: That was required by -- if I -- our sanitary utility department reviewed it, given the fact that private common collectors cannot cross over property lines, and I imagine, Mr. MacMann, that may be why you're asking the question.

MR. MACMANN: That is why I was asking the question. I wasn't aware.

MR. ZENNER: And I believe -- and I believe that that is why our utility requested that the separate easement, by separate document that's in the southerly portion of this property was platted to allow for the connection to an existing public main that would, at some point, afford the connection if it is

not already --

MR. MACMANN: So when we do the PPC in there, they have an option?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. That would be in --

MR. MACMANN: That's -- that's what I wanted to know. Thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions of staff? As is in past practices, it's not a public hearing, but we would open it to anyone that's in the room that would like to come forward and give us any information that's relevant to this case. Please just give us your name and address.

MR. SCHWEIKERT: Kevin Schweikert with Brush and Associates here representing the Wilsons. I think the staff's report pretty well described the whole thing for me, but happy to answer any questions you might have of me.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. Commissioners, is there any questions of this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Schweikert. Anyone else like to speak on this case? I see none. Commissioners, any discussion, questions? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Case 17-178, Northern Heights Plat 2-A, final plat design modifications, I move to approve.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. Thank you, Ms. Rushing. Commissioners, we have a motion that has been seconded, a motion made by Mr. Stanton for approval of Case 17-178, and a second by Ms. Rushing. Is there any discussion needed further on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready for a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

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

MR. STRODTMAN: At this time, I would ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 17-183, 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: It's just a point -- it's a point of information. Four months ago or so, attended the Master Plan meeting at Columbia College for my neighborhood. This was brought up just as it was going to be a parking lot. FYI.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacMann. Anything additional, Commissioners? I see none.

Case No. 17-183

A request by Engineering Surveys and Services (agent), on behalf of Columbia College (owner), for approval of a one-lot minor subdivision to be known as "Columbia College North Subdivision" and a design adjustment to the required half-width dedication requirements for Rangeline Street. The subject 1.44-acre parcel is contiguous with Columbia College properties north of Wilkes Boulevard, between Rangeline Street and Eighth Street.

MR. STRODTMAN: 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 "Columbia College North Subdivision" and the requested design modification.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Commissioners, questions for staff? Yes, Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Mr. Palmer, if you could go back to the black and white map, and you indicated that there were -- it looks like the parking lot or the lot that we're talking about kind of slices off the corner of that building on the R-2 lot, but on the aerial photograph, it seems further away, so I just didn't know which one is --

MR. PALMER: Yeah. The original aerial here, they intended to work around that building, but in doing so, they were leaving a remnant of the lot, which I can point out here. They're leaving this little piece kind of unattached to anything, so that we're essentially creating a nonlegal lot that has no access and is kind of useless. And so staff, as part of our recommendation or as part of our review, asked them to extend this lot line up, which is actually the current lot line or the legal lot line of this property. This little piece here is actually being -- has been deeded off to this property, so that's actually one contiguous lot, but that's not a legal lot, and that's kind of what we're here for is to create legal lots so they can be used for future purposes.

MS. BURNS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional questions? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a quick follow up on Commissioner Burns' point. Could you brief for me very quickly what Columbia College is going to do with that white building, if they're going to --

MR. PALMER: That's actually the Barnes Confectionary. It's the most notable property in the City --

MR. MACMANN: Well, you said they were going to -- what are they going to do to address this issue?

MR. PALMER: Well, as I said, with this plan, the original plan was to notch out that corner to fix the nonconformance so that -- that building can stay there and they can improve the lot around it. The other thing is, as you can see in that aerial, and that's accurate -- I don't know to what extent, but it does also cross the lot line to the south where New Life Evangelistic Center resides. So they can't obviously fix all of those issues at once because they don't own that property on the southwest corner.

MR. MACMANN: So we will approve these as legal nonconformed just for the time being?

MR. PALMER: The legal lot that we'll create here is -- is its own legal lot. The nonconformance

exists and it just remains, so you're not really approving anything.

MR. MACMANN: So we're good then. That's all I wanted to know. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? Mr. Palmer, I've got a quick question. Southeast corner, is that a Columbia College parcel?

MR. PALMER: No.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Thank you. As is in past practices, this is -- this is not a public hearing, but if there is anyone in the audience that would like to come forward and give us information that's relevant to this case, you're welcome to come forward. We just ask your name and address.

MR. CARROZ: Good evening. Fred Carroz, Engineering Surveys and Services, 1113 Fay Street, Columbia, Missouri. To answer Mr. MacMann's point about the old confectionary, and -- the college has no plans for it at this time. It is currently a rental property for the college.

MR. MACMANN: It's occupied, is it not?

MR. CARROZ: I cannot answer that.

MR. MACMANN: I'm sorry. I was out of turn. You go ahead and finish, and then I'll ask you questions.

MR. CARROZ: Currently, they have no plans for it right now. They just wanted to separate the two parcels so they could get the parking lot constructed in a legal lot. I'd be happy to answer any further questions.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, is there any questions of this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I just -- I believe it's occupied or was very recently, so --

MR. CARROZ: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. Any additional guests like to come forward? I see none. Commissioners, questions, comments, discussion needed? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: In the case of 17-183, I move to approve the Columbia College North Subdivision and the requested design modification.

MS. LOE: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. We had a motion made by Ms. Russell, seconded by Ms. Loe for approval of Case 17-183. Commissioners, is there any further discussion needed on this case and second? 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. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder. Motion carries 9-0.

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Our recommendation for approval of Case 17-183 will be forwarded to City Council for their review. Moving on to Case 17-187, Commissioners, at this time, I would ask if there is any Commissioners that has had an ex parte communication prior to this meeting

related to Case 17-187, that you would disclose it at this time so that all Commissioners have the same information in front of us. I see none.

Case No. 17-187

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of Campus Lutheran Church (owner), for approval of a one-lot replat of R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) zoned property, to be known as the final plat of "Campus Lutheran" and a design adjustment to the half-width right-of-way dedication requirements for College Avenue. The 1.91-acre subject site is located at the northeast corner of College Avenue and Anthony Street, and addressed as 304 South College Avenue.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the final plat for Campus Lutheran and the design adjustment to Appendix A-3(a) to waive additional right-of-way dedication for College Avenue.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Commissioners, are there any questions of staff? I see none. As is in past practice, if there is anyone in the audience that would like to come forward and give us any relevant information, we would welcome that at this time.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. The only other thing I would like to add, I think Mr. Smith did a good job of wrapping up this relatively routine platting request, but we are not a part of the East Campus Neighborhood Association. We're not a part of the Overlay District. However, given recent concerns that those neighbors have had with regards to replatting multiple R-MF lots into a larger lot, we did reach out to those folks and had meetings to inform them what the intentions of the church are. We met with them several weeks ago and we've contacted them several times since then, as late as yesterday even. They have given us no indication that they have any concern with what the church is doing, what the church's plans are. They reviewed our building plans, they reviewed our site improvements, and they have not indicated that they have any concerns or questions about -- about what the church's intentions are. They think the church is a good neighbor. It's been there just as long as many of them have. So with that said, I'd like to answer any questions the Commission may have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? I see none, Mr. Crockett, and thank you for reaching out to those neighborhood associations. We appreciate it. Thank you, sir. Any additional speakers? I see none. Commissioners, questions? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: In Case 17-187, Campus Lutheran Final Plat and design adjustments, I move to approve the final plat and design adjustments.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stanton, for that motion and, Ms. Russell, thank you for that second. Commissioners, any questions, discussion needed on this motion and second? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Our recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration. Moving on to Case -- our last subdivision, our Case 17-195, at this time, I would ask if Commissioners if there has been any ex parte communication prior to this meeting related to Case 17-195, that you would disclose that at this time so that all Commissioners have the same information in front of us at the same time to consider. I see none.

Case No. 17-195

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Woodland Hills Properties, LLC (owner), for approval of a one-lot final plat to be known as "Copperstone Plat 7A". The proposed plat will consolidate Lots 102A and 217A of Copperstone Plat 7. The subject parcels are located at the intersection of Silver Valley Drive and Copperstone Creek Drive and contain 0.93 total acres.

MR. STRODTMAN: 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 "Copperstone Plat 7A" dated August 4, 2017.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Commissioners, is there any questions of staff? I see none. As is in past practice, this is not a public hearing, but if there's anyone in the audience that would like to come forward and give us any relevant information on Case 17-195, we would ask at this time. I see none. Commissioners, discussion, questions? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: This appears to be housekeeping. I'll make a motion in Case 17-195, Copperstone Plat 7A final plat and design modification, motion to approve -- approval of Copperstone Plat 7A.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe, for that motion, and Ms. Russell for that second. Do we have any questions or comments on this motion?

MR. MACMANN: Just a point of clarification. That was with the design modification, Commissioner Loe? That's a --

MS. LOE: That's -- I included the design --

MR. MACMANN: Did you? Okay. I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

MR. ZENNER: And if we may, we'll point out that there is no design modification.

MS. LOE: Oh. Okay. I was --

MR. ZENNER: That's what Mr. Palmer and I were discussing, what was it. There is none. Unfortunately, that was an error in the title. What Mr. -- what Chairman Strodtman read is just --

MR. MACMANN: I thought the title was --

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. The title on the slide is wrong, but what Mr. Strodtman read as the case

title did not include a design modification, and that is the correct title. So it is just an approval of Plat 7A for Copperstone.

MS. LOE: Approval -- move to approve Copperstone Plat 7A dated August 4, 2017.

MS. RUSSELL: And second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you and thank you for that second. Commissioners, any additional discussion needed? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

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

VI) PUBLIC HEARINGS

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, I would ask at this time if there has been any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 17-170 that you please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of the case in front of us. I see none. Thank you.

Case 17-170

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of AMW Investment Properties, LLC (owner) for approval of PD zoning and associated PD plan to be known as "Sidra Subdivision PD Plan". The 0.86-acre site is located at the northeast corner of Primrose Drive and North Stadium Boulevard. (This item was tabled at the July 20, 2017 meeting.)

MR. STRODTMAN: 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 "Sidra Subdivision Plat 2 - PD development plan."

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you. Mr. Palmer, the neighbors have had any input on this, good, bad, indifferent?

MR. PALMER: Just questioning what the intent is here and whether or not, you know, the typical stuff about viewing patios, you know, the rear patios. There actually are no patios on the -- one the plan as proposed.

MR. MACMANN: I missed this PIM. Was it well attended or not attended?

MR. PALMER: Just the neighbors to the north there, the one single-family neighbor was in attendance, or the two of them. And I think their -- their main concern was -- was seeing the neighbors and -- and in response to that, the developer gladly added the screening.

MR. MACMANN: The buffer. Okay.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Which is not required.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? Mr. Palmer, it seems like a lot of parking lot. Is that just -- it's in excess of what would be normal for a single-family. Right? You said a two and a half would be normal, so it would be more like 13, 15 stalls versus 20-some?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. It's actually two for a single family, so that would be ten. And then they're offering, so double is twenty.

MR. STRODTMAN: They're doubling the parking?

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: Is there any reason for that?

MR. PALMER: Just in an effort to offer substantial parking so that there's not parking on the street and so on because I think that's already an issue in that neighborhood.

MR. STRODTMAN: So there would be a concern with multi-families living in one of these units, or somehow with all that parking, it seems like it's an overkill of parking for single-family homes.

MR. PALMER: Well, I mean, it is single-family. They're intended to be owner occupied. That's not necessarily something that -- that can be dictated up front.

MR. STRODTMAN: I understand. I understand.

MR. PALMER: But, yeah. There's nothing really --

MR. STRODTMAN: It seems like there's more opportunity for some green space, if you would take half that parking lot out, so --

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Chairman, if I may point out.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, sir.

MR. ZENNER: If this were a more traditional single-family scenario with individual driveways, you would probably have storage capacity for the additional vehicles that are accommodated within that parking lot on each individual lot. So given the characteristic of how this is an in-common parking environment, the paved area may be equivalent to what you would have had as individual private-driveway'd lots. So while it does seem excessive, it's because it's striped, whereas on a private driveway, you wouldn't have these spaces striped. And if we go back to the aerial photography that is here and you look at the duplex parking areas, those duplex parking areas probably have anywhere between three spaces or more per half of the duplex.

MR. STRODTMAN: Probably, yeah.

MR. ZENNER: So that would explain a little bit also as to why it would appear as though there is more pavement being provided on the plan that would otherwise be necessary. It has to deal with a little bit of the -- the unique nature of the land use and the configuration.

MR. STRODTMAN: Good point. It makes -- it makes good sense, so thank you for that. Any additional questions, Commissioners, of staff? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I noticed that in their written statement of intent, they mention six lots. Is it –

MR. PALMER: It actually was decreased.

MS. RUSHING: To five?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. The initial plan did not include the full 25-foot setback on each side as required of a PD development. And so when they revised that, they had to drop a lot in order to fit all that in or a drop a unit.

MS. RUSHING: I think you covered this, but I just want to make sure. That is a sidewalk all the way around that outside?

MR. PALMER: Correct. And -- and connecting directly to the intersection.

MS. RUSHING: And those little dots are trees. Right?

MR. PALMER: Correct.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: Pretty trees.

MR. ZENNER: Ms. Rushing, if I may, also I appreciate your identification of the statement of intent increase in the units. The plan is depicting and the plan will govern for development. However, in an effort to ensure that there is congruency between the two, we will request that the statement of intent be revised prior to forwarding this item to Council.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Any additional questions, Commissioners, of staff? I see none. I'll go ahead and open this.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: It is a public hearing for Case 17-170, so please come forward. Give us your name and address and limit your discussions to three minutes.

MR. CROCKETT: Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I believe Mr. -- Mr. Palmer did a good job with the staff report, covered it really well. Ms. Rushing, you are correct. Their original proposal did have six units. I believe this is the reason why this project was tabled at the last meeting was because there was some discrepancy between the six and setbacks and how we were going to address that and how we desired to move forward, and I don't think we had staff support in what we were looking for, so we reduced it from six to five. I will note that the project is currently zoned R-2, and if we were to develop it, we could develop it -- could ask for a preliminary plat that showed three R-2 lots that would have three duplexes or six total units. So really we wanted this configuration -- it really limits or reduces our density slightly. It is a little bit larger parking lot than normal, but I think when you look and weigh it out with what could be done, I think we're pretty similar. We have ramped up our landscaping across the board, across the entire development. If you will look also, the development slides from the north to the south, so the units themselves will sit below -- slightly below the property line to the north. So that in itself is going to help buffer or give a line of sight screen from the neighbor to the north. That, along with the additional landscaping, we think will -- will enhance that area. So again there is a lot of sidewalk on this property. We are bordered by three -- three streets. We understand that we

were supposed to front onto the street in which we have access from, but we think that this configuration really suits the -- the intent of the regulations a little better. You're -- the majority of the traffic as they come down is going to see the front of the units as opposed to the rear of the units, and so we think that's going to be more pleasing than -- than flipping them around and the bulk of the traffic -- you know, 98 percent of the traffic is going to look at the back of the units. And so we think that this is a -- a better configuration for this site. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker?
Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Crockett, I understand these are zero lot line --

MR. CROCKETT: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: -- described, but there's no -- is there any private outdoor space for the units, just out of curiosity?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, I mean, we have the -- the entire exterior is going to be common space. It's going to be owned in common ownership. And so, you know, we have a detention basin down there, but that will be relatively shallow. It's going to be relatively dry at most all times. And so there's going to be common space down there. There will be common space behind the units themselves. So yes, there are some exterior common spaces, but it is just that, it's common. So all the units share.

MS. RUSHING: So are there patios or decks or anything like that on the rear of those buildings?

MR. CROCKETT: There will probably be small patios would be all that there would be. It would be just a minimal concrete pad for a patio. There will be no decks, I don't believe.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners, of this speaker? Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Anybody else like to come forward and speak on this matter?

MR. CLARAHAN: Good evening. I'm Rob Clarahan; I live at 2011 Iris Drive. So if you could follow Primrose on down the street a little bit, about a quarter of a mile, I live out there. Lovely neighborhood. I only have a few questions in regards to the site. The density issue, I think, is a concern for a lot of people of our neighborhood because the traffic that comes from Stadium turns into the neighborhood pretty heavy at times. The same traffic that comes from Stadium to the south is heavy at times. And even though there are a couple of places to come into the neighborhood, Primrose from Stadium is a main thoroughfare there. And to have additional housing right on that site, it -- it can bottleneck because people come from the north and slide in. There's a yield sign. It's barely a yield sign. They're coming at a pretty good clip. It's, I would say, 20, 25, 30 miles an hour coming through there. So people trying to get out -- additional people coming out could be an issue. But that's not as -- probably as important as -- I guess I'm looking for a definition for the water-retention pond. Is that concrete or is that just soil, because what's in that spot that would be located as a retention pond, it's an eroded piece of soil and there's a tree there, and that's really about it. So is it -- does that stay the same or is there plans to make that better because a water-retention pond sounds like a terrible eyesore coming in.

MR. STRODTMAN: It would be -- it would not be concrete, it would be a soil-contained structure

that would have to be maintained, you know, per the regulations that would come along with that. So that it would be -- it would be an improvement from what's there today.

MR. CLARAHAN: Oh, that would be good.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. And there's a pipe that runs at the bottom to take it to some other storm sewer. If we had the -- yeah. Look up there. See where the pond, there's a pipe coming out of there, so it's --

MR. STRODTMAN: It'll be dry -- it'll be dry most of the time.

MR. STANTON: Photo up there of the pipe -- yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: It'll be dry most of the time.

MR. CLARAHAN: Okay. So it's going to be any worse than it is right now?

MR. STANTON: Like a rain garden would be the best way kind of to --

MR. CLARAHAN: Third thing is is there -- and I really can't see on there. Is there a plan for a sidewalk on the Stadium side?

MR. STRODTMAN: There's sidewalks on three sides, so it would be on the Stadium, the corner. It would be on three sides all except for the back of it --

MR. STANTON: The north, yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- or the north side.

MR. CLARAHAN: I understand. Well, all right. Those are my questions. Thank you very much for your time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, sir, for coming this evening? Any additional speakers?

MS. COY: My name is Maureen Coy, and I live at 2208 Iris Drive. I -- I have some concerns just about the look of it as driving into the subdivision. My concern is that when you drive -- I drive down the hill of Stadium, and then I turn onto Primrose. The first thing I'm going to see to the right is a parking lot with 20 cars in it along with a water-retention pond. So I have some concerns about that being the first thing you see when you drive into Valley View Subdivision is that parking lot. I think it's going to be pretty big. I think, too, that -- well, so that -- that is my main concern is just the aesthetics, the look of it as you come into the subdivision. A lot of people in Valley View take a lot of pride in their homes and I understand that these will be owned, but over time, I could see these being owned and then rented out, and so I have some concern about that, too. The storm water, right off, I don't know too much about that, but you've got the -- you're taking a lot -- you're taking up a lot of surface there that was ground, and you're making it impervious, you know. And you've got the roofs for the townhouses. You -- to me, it almost seems like two-thirds of that lot will now be impervious. And so I'm curious as to whether that water-retention pond really could in a flash flood or some of the crazy four, five, six inches of rain that we've had in the past, if it can really hold that water and not cause flash flooding at the corner of Stadium and Primrose.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. I'll try to answer a couple of your questions. You know, obviously, the

landscaping is taken into consideration and is up to the standards and requirements that are required in this particular case. So a lot of what you -- you know, there would be quite a bit more landscaping installed than what is there today, so it's going to help minimize some of what your concerns would be. As mentioned earlier, this -- this location could or would or it could have up to six units on it, so this site, even though -- or this plan, even though you may feel it's too dense, it actually could even be higher density and still be within legal -- you know, legal code. Engineering or the storm-water related, we trust the engineers know what they're doing and they've been paid to calculate how much flow would be related to this project and that retention pond would be based on those calculations. And so I think we've come a long, long ways in the last how many years in our storm-water control within the City of Columbia, and I trust that they've done that -- their homework and that it will accommodate it.

MS. COY: Now -- well, when you say this is not going to be concrete, that it's going to be ground. So explain what it looks like.

MR. STRODTMAN: It's -- it's a retention basin. You see them throughout the City, a lot of them. They're grass. They sometimes will have some cattails, potentially, depending on if it's holding water. Most of them are made to not hold water, it's to pass through. It's a retain it for a short term and then release it, it's not to hold water in the sense of a pond. So maybe the pond would be a bad word. So that pipe in the bottom of it is to get water out of it, and it's just to slow it down, let the soil take a lot of the minerals and -- or a lot of the nutrients or the things out of the water, as well as absorb a lot of water, and then what is left goes out the pipe and it goes on down. So it maintains it so we don't have these flash floods of water when all these parking lots dump off at the same time. It can -- it stops it, slows it, some of it is absorbed, cleaned up. What's not is passed on at a slower rate.

MR. PALMER: Mr. Chairman, I can expand on that, if you don't mind?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Mr. Palmer.

MR. PALMER: Basically, what you'll see there is just a depression in the ground that's designed to -- to slow the flow of water across the site. And as you stated, engineering calculations have to be made in order to make sure that it's mitigating the runoff that's being created by the development. So we have to trust that the engineers are doing their job there and we also check those calculations when they come in with further building permits.

MR. ZENNER: That's exactly it. Predevelopment flow rate must be controlled with postdevelopment flow, meaning what crosses this site as an undeveloped tract of land cannot be exceeded in a developed state, so the pond itself or this retention area and the control devices that allow the water to be moved through that retention pond have controls within them that ensure that the metering of the water as it leaves the site is no greater. Our storm-water ordinances, as our Chairman has explained, have advanced greatly over the years. The engineer and design professional associated with this actual formal development will have to run a series of different calculations based on a number of different types of storm events in order to ensure that this particular BMP or this -- this feature will function properly under those varying conditions in the postdeveloped state, which has to take into

account all of the impervious surface that is being created. So what's depicted here may not necessarily be what gets built. It may be slightly larger, it may be configured a little bit differently. That all is yet to be determined based upon final engineering design plans.

MR. PALMER: And the actual application of the vegetation within that area, it can vary from they might just plant it with grass. They might plant it with native grasses. It just depends on kind of the application they're trying to achieve here. Like Mr. Strodtman mentioned, sometimes they're used to filter contaminants, such as sediment and everything out of the water before it's passed on to the broader storm-water system. That's not indicated at this point, so the best description I can give you is that it's a depression in the ground and it may or may not have some kind of native plants in it or it may just be grass -- a grass bottom depending on whether they want to make it a double-use area. Like, it's adjacent to the largest chunk of their usable open space, so they may try to incorporate it as part of that open space when it's dry so that they can use it for whatever, you know. So I don't anticipate you seeing some garish thing out there.

MR. STRODTMAN: There's standards that have to be maintained, you know. They just can't be -- it has to work.

MS. COY: And then why is it being changed from an R-2 to a PD? Why -- why do we have zoning laws or zoning things? Why, if that was determined that that was the best zoning for that corner, why are you proposing that it be changed?

MR. STRODTMAN: I mean, that was the way it was -- the City staff will work with the applicant to find the best route to develop this project. And as they mentioned, it could have been three separate duplexes, and so you would have had three separate driveways, separate parking lots, you know, three probably separate back -- back paths because you would have really chopped up this lot quite a bit more probably than the way it is now. But, staff, I'll let you speak on the actual reasoning for the plan.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Even -- even in the R-MF zoning district, as I stated in the staff report, the -- the orientation of the building would have to be towards Rashid, and then that, in effect, ruins your open space. You don't have a large contiguous open space to use, so that -- that's part of it. But again, as Chairman Strodtman stated, you're looking at one access point instead of three or even more potentially. If it's in this configuration, but a different design, you would have potentially all five or six units having their own access point onto Rashid. Then also the aesthetic of it, instead of looking at the rear of the house along Stadium and probably also a parking lot -- I haven't laid it out myself, but ostensibly you could imagine. If -- if the buildings are turned to the -- the street frontage, the parking would potentially have to go somewhere if it's still required. So on the east side, you'd be looking at probably the back of a building and potentially some parking area back there, and that's based on the fact that the storm-water detention pretty much has to be at the south side because that's the way the topography flows, but that's kind of the --

MR. STRODTMAN: With this layout as planned, you're getting a front view. As you're coming south, going down the hill and you're going to turn into your neighborhood, you're looking at the front of

these homes. In the -- in the other way, you would have been looking at the rear of these homes.

MS. COY: And the parking lot.

MR. STRODTMAN: And the parking lot, too. So I think you really -- and then on the north side, it's kind of being built into the hill a little bit, so the rear of the homes are kind of being taken care of by the topography as well as all the increased landscaping that you can see there. So I think it's a much better improvement than what could be legally put there under its current zoning.

MS. COY: The only thing I -- I would have to say is most duplexes don't have a parking lot, they have a driveway and -- and garages, so people, you know, either use the garage or use the parking lot. And I think part of the reason that this has been decided is there's probably no availability of parking on Rashid.

MR. STANTON: Well, you could put --

MR. STRODTMAN: Well, and you don't want -- I mean, you want them to park in that parking lot and not be on Rashid, and -- and -- and garages are not required, so you don't have to have a garage. And really, ma'am, you really, honestly, you don't want three driveways coming onto Rashid, three individual driveways with their own parking lots, the back of the buildings facing -- you know, the back would be on Stadium, so as you go by that golf course and as you turn into the neighborhood, you would look at the back, the barbecue grills, the bicycles, whatever is in the backyard -- swimming pools, you know, whatever people do. Then you pass into your -- into your neighborhood and go home. I think this, you -- sure, you're seeing some concrete, but I think it's -- you know, it's a much better example. And I was questioning the number of stalls because I was looking at it from a stall count as opposed to I'm not counting a driveway into the garage, which they don't have in this case, but you might, so you would have that much concrete. You probably have just as much -- if you were to take six homes -- or five homes of your -- where you live, and you put five homes together and your driveways and your parking spaces, you probably have just as much or more than they do here in front. They just have it all together, so it's a little more deceiving. That's why I questioned it, too. So I think with that retention pond on the corner, more landscaping, you know, this topography is tough. It's at the bottom of the hill. It's a challenge, you know. You're not going to probably find a single home that wants to live in that location because of, one, what it's zoned, and, two, is this amount of traffic that's on that corner. I would say someday, you're probably going to see a light or something at that intersection. I don't think that it'll be ever -- forever like that, because you have a lot of traffic, not from this -- these five homes, but there's a lot of homes back in there that are feeding into this, that someday that intersection, it'll be a roundabout or a light or something, but I have no knowledge of that at this point.

MS. COY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you for coming, ma'am. Commissioners, any questions of that speaker? I see none. Thank you, Ms. Coy. Any additional speakers that would like to come forward?

MR. PASLEY: Filmore Pasley, 2105 North Stadium Boulevard. My sister and I own the home -- house to the north. We're very concerned about the way this lays, that we will be landlocked. If you look

at where our house is, there's another lot to the north of us owned by someone else. If eventually something happens to Stadium, we're -- we're not going to have an entrance to our land there, so we're concerned about that. Everybody has talked about these being built down the hill. I'll guarantee you it's not more than a five-, ten-foot drop till you get halfway down that hill, then it falls completely off. So saying it's going to be down a hill, maybe five foot off there or something like that. I'm kind of concerned with the two-story house going all the way across there. All five of these put together, it's going to block everything from like everybody else says, looking to the north for us, looking to the south. It just seems kind of strange you would put it that way when you've got a nice park and a lake right across the street that everybody could look at there. So kind of concerned about the way it -- it lays. We're the ones that are going to be looking at all those grills and all that stuff on the backyard and stuff. So we've been there over 50 years and it seems like us paying our taxes for all these years, we don't get the same weight that the contractors get when they come in. You all look at it as -- it says in here, Technically meets the requirements, so we build it. I don't understand that, why it's always that. Is that really what's best for the land, to put two-story buildings through there where nobody can see by and all that? It says here -- article down, They moved the units to the rear of the busy street where may be seen as an eyesore. Well, we're the ones seeing the eyesore. It's not just somebody driving down the street that's not really paying attention. It says in the paragraph up here, Their intent is to sell it. They're going to come in, make some money off this. It's great for the City, for taxes and stuff like that, but the contractor comes in, builds these all right next to one another, because it's cheaper for them, and we kind of let them get away with that and they're gone. And so that's some of the concerns we have.

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll try to answer a couple of your questions. I may -- I won't be able to answer all of them. But -- and I may have forgot a couple of them in order, so bear with me. One is we -- we cannot take your entrance away. You'll always have access to your property. It is illegal for you not to have access to your property. Okay? So if Stadium or -- is widened or changed or whatever, there would be modifications to your driveway. I don't know what that would look like, you know, but there could be modifications, but you'll always have a driveway. You'll always have access to your home and to your property. It would be illegal for them to take access away from your property. So now your driveway may be different than it is today, but you'd still have access to that. What the grade is today and what the height is, that five, six foot that you referenced may not be what the grade is going to be when they're done, so those homes could easily dropped down and built into the hill and some of the dirt brought out and built into -- for the parking lot to be raised up and flatten out that hillside for the parking lot. So don't completely visualize it today the way it is and the houses are just going to be built on the hill that's there today because there's going to be grading done. And I -- I'm not an expert engineer, didn't know what the grading feet is, but there will be grading done, so those homes will be built in and dropped down a little bit. Obviously, if you look at the plan, and it's not in front of us, but they've -- they've put a lot of landscaping on the north side which is to address you -- your home. So they're trying to help with the landscaping, you know. And if -- if -- if it is, you know, five feet or greater of a drop, you're not going to be

seeing the barbecue grills, you're going to be seeing the deck or the rooftops of the homes, the back of them. You're not going to be seeing down below because that's going to be into the hill or at least how I visualize it. Again, I'm not an engineer. Lastly, and I probably forgot a couple of your items, and I apologize for that. If -- if they would done the duplexes for a couple thoughts. Typically, the duplexes are going to be rentals. You have a much better likelihood these are going to be homeowners that live in these homes because they're single-families that are bought that way. So it doesn't have to be that way, but more than likely, it is going to be like that. You can still own a duplex, too, and live there, too. I'm not saying that it wouldn't be the case. Also, if they did the individual driveways with three duplexes, you're required to front the -- your front door has to front the street that your address is on. So even though you have a beautiful golf course across behind you, they would not be able to face that direction because their entrances, their exits are behind them. Their street is behind them, so the house would have to face the street that your address is on, if that makes sense.

MR. PASLEY: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: So even though I agree with you that it's a shame that that beautiful golf course isn't what they look out their front window, but at least they see that out their back window of their homes because they're not -- they're required to have their front door facing the street that their address is on. So sorry I didn't maybe answer all your questions.

MR. PASLEY: Oh, that's fine. We did put an offer out that we might be willing to sell what we had. We didn't hear anything until tonight, and thought that might help them out in a way, but --

MR. STRODTMAN: Yeah. We don't touch or look at the financial side at all.

MR. PASLEY: Sure.

MR. STRODTMAN: We just try to look at what's legal and right for that -- that property to do and that's what we try to look at. We try to minimize your concerns and exposures because we do understand that you've been there for many, many years, and it's going to be a different view than there is today, but the golf course across the street is still a golf course, so that's the best for you and I can't speak for what Stadium is going to be like in the future other than it will probably be different. Commissioners, is there any questions for this speaker? Thank you for coming, sir. We do appreciate it, and thanks for the questions. Any additional speakers?

MS. GARRETT: Hello.

MR. STRODTMAN: Hello.

MS. GARRETT: My name is Marilyn Garrett, and I live at 4188 Tara Lake Drive. That's my brother. I do want to question a couple of things. When you talked about this screening that runs along our property line, it -- they told us in the first meeting that it -- that the back of these buildings would be 35 feet high, so that's what we're basing that on is that we're going to look at this bank of 35-feet high, and that the patios -- my concern is we were told they're four bedroom, at least four-bedroom units or whatever you want to call those. So from a density standpoint, my concern, because today I had two or three people, they just walked through the middle of our yard. If their back doors open out with their

patio, how many people, you know, are we going to be seeing? We already see so many people because the folks that are behind at the back of our property, they already all walk through there, and they all have patios that look out, so we get to hear everything they say and everything they do, every fight they get into. So again, I guess that's my concern about that, that, you know, how many more people are we just added in those five units?

MR. STRODTMAN: A couple -- a couple thoughts, and again, I'm not an architect or an engineer. I just, you know, do this for a volunteer thing, but a couple of thoughts. One is the 35 feet I think you referenced or 30-some feet that you -- did you reference 35 feet?

MS. GARRETT: They're tall, yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Again, it's -- it's not from a grade that's there today, and it's not taking 35 feet from here straight up. Again, there's -- there's -- you know, there's a topography issue. There's -- you know, there's a little bit of hill there. So it's -- you know, I wouldn't go to the highest point and go 35 feet up and -- you know, it's not going to be that -- that way. It's going to be -- and again, you know, you're welcome to get an engineer to help give you the feed of how much different -- you know, what it is you're truly going to see is not going to be 35 feet of a house from your home.

MS. GARRETT: That's what we were told by Crockett Engineering at the last meeting, so --

MR. STRODTMAN: Again, I'm not an engineer, so I'm not going to --

MS. GARRETT: I'm -- base it on what we were told.

MR. STRODTMAN: I understand. Also, if you look here, the back of the homes, there's -- it's -- it's -- there's not much -- there's -- it's a fairly tight area, so there's not going to be a large -- and Mr. Crockett kind of referenced this earlier in his question I think Ms. Rushing asked about the back deck -- patios. They're fairly small. There's not a lot of depth back there, so I don't think that you're going to find large patio decks that are built up and -- and large because there's just not that much room before they get into the landscaping and the trees and things, and so, you know, there's just not that kind of --

MS. GARRETT: Could somebody talk to us about the landscaping and the trees because there's just a lot of people coming out their back doors at us.

MR. STRODTMAN: The process, ma'am, would be is that depending on what happens this evening, you would be -- you know, if it's approved and goes to City Council, you're welcome to go to a City Council meeting when this is going to be heard there and you can, you know, give your views there, too. City staff has worked with the police department, the fire department, the -- you know, the utility departments, all departments within the City staff have -- has looked at this plan and have given their approval of it before it gets to us. So we trust that they have taken a lot of those -- you know, things into consideration. And as such here, you would be welcome, assuming we approve it, to go to City Council. If we don't approve it, then there would be no need for -- well, you could still go to City Council because it would still go there. Mr. Anthony -- Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: If you had a pencil, and I want you to put yourself in this person's perspective, as well --

MS. GARRETT: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: -- because they've got money on the table; you've got money on the table in your property. What would you do to fix your concerns if you were then?

MS. GARRETT: A fence.

MR. STANTON: A fence in the back?

MS. GARRETT: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: A privacy fence?

MS. GARRETT: I don't want people just walking out their back door through my yard. A significant fence, you know. If you just throw some trees out there, that's not going to stop anybody.

MR. STANTON: Well, your brother just -- well, then -- then you just -- you'd rather just look a fence versus trees and --

MS. GARRETT: Well, we're already getting the 30-, 35-foot, we're already looking at that, and then my -- mine is safety. There's a safety issue here having that many people that just walk out their back door into your yard. Like I said, we've already experienced it with the duplexes behind us. There's been some nasty, ugly fights back there and, you know, people drinking lots of beer and throwing stuff around, and we hear everything they say. So, you know, it's just --

MR. STANTON: And I don't want to stereotype the neighborhood, but, you know, these would be homeowners.

MS. GARRETT: Those are homeowners.

MR. STANTON: These are like row homes or row houses.

MS. GARRETT: They own -- it's a duplex. They -- you have an owner on one side and rent out the other, so --

MR. STANTON: Okay. So a fence would make you happy?

MS. GARRETT: Well, I'm just saying --

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. GARRETT: -- I -- I'm -- there's safety issue here for me.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. GARRETT: Because you're adding that many more people that -- and everybody goes up to the gas station. Okay? Everybody back there. There is a gas station right there, a huge one, and everybody is traipsing through the yard to get to that gas station because the place behind it is all fenced in, so you can't get through that way, so the only way you can get through is through us.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional questions?

MR. TOOHEY: Do you actually live on the property, because when you gave your address, it was a different address.

MS. GARRETT: Not right now. We -- we actually -- it's vacant right now. Like my brother said, we had offered it for sale, so --

MR. TOOHEY: Okay.

MS. GARRETT: No, I don't. I was -- I'm there, but --

MR. STRODTMAN: But don't reside there?

MS. GARRETT: Yeah. We haven't decided yet.

MR. STRODTMAN: No one is residing there currently? It's vacant, you said?

MS. GARRETT: Right now.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Ms. -- Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Are you part of a neighborhood association?

MS. GARRETT: No. I didn't even know there was one. We were there before Valley View Gardens ever went in.

MS. BURNS: I would suggest you contact your neighborhood association and share your concerns and see what others' concerns might be and come when the City Council discusses this, have a plan that the neighborhood is behind. And whether that's asking for a fence or additional landscaping and possibly talking with the developer prior to that meeting and coming to some sort of agreement that there is an understanding that if additions are going to be made, that they will be made.

MS. GARRETT: Okay. Yeah. Because, I mean, it's just a high-traffic area through there. They just drop stuff, throw stuff.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Thank you, ma'am.

MS. GARRETT: Uh-huh. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional speakers this evening on this matter? I see none. We'll go ahead and close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners? Questions, discussions, additional information needed from staff?

MR. MACMANN: I had a quick question for staff.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I think I know the answer, but you can verify for this for me, Mr. Palmer. This area belongs to or is represented by Councilperson Trapp; is that correct?

MR. PALMER: That's correct.

MR. MACMANN: The Second Ward. That may be other -- another option for the individuals.

MR. STRODTMAN: Another option for the folks here that do not like this project would be to reach out to your City Councilman, which would be Michael Trapp would your Ward 2. Additional questions, Commissioners, comments, thoughts, concerns? Motion? Lottery ticket winning number? I'm open. Yes, Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: In the case of 17-170, I move to approve the Sidra Subdivision Plat 2 Planned Development Plan.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Russell, for that motion, and Ms. Rushing for that second.

Commissioners, is there any questions on the motion for approval of Case 17-170? I see none.

Ms. Burns, when you're ready for a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns, for that. Our recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. And for you citizens that were here this evening, you're welcome, obviously, to go to City Council and express your feelings to our City Council, also, or welcome to Mr. Trapp. Case 17-188, at this time, I would ask if any Commissioner who has any ex parte communication prior to this meeting related to this Case 17-188, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of the case in front of us. Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I haven't had any ex parte communication, but just wanted my fellow commissioners to know that in May 2017, my husband and I made a financial contribution to this project. We received no goods or services in return.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns, for that information. Is there any additional information, Commissioners? I see none.

Case No. 17-188

A request by McClure Engineering Company (agent) on behalf of the City of Columbia (owner) for approval of a PD Plan to be known as "Clary-Shy Agriculture Park PD Plan" and associated Statement of Intent. The 17.21-acre subject property is located at the northwest corner of Ash Street and Clinkscales Road.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the Clary-Shy Agriculture Park PD Plan and the noted exceptions.

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

MS. RUSHING: I just want to clarify. The north side of that property, that little entrance drive will continue along the north side of the property right up there?

MR. SMITH: Here?

MS. RUSHING: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: Correct. That would not be affected in this plan. It will remain as it is.

MS. RUSHING: Okay. And what is -- do you know what the items are in the upper left-hand corner, the northwest corner?

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh. This is the detention basin, so it's their storm-water maintenance area.

MS. RUSHING: And north of that, is that the parking drive for that building north of there? Do you see what I'm talking about, across -- kind of runs across that property line?

MR. SMITH: I don't see a building. This is, I think, a continuation of a walking trail in here. There is a little bit of a grade in here, as well, some sensitive areas that are part again, I think, of storm-water detention. I don't think there's any existing building, but we can go back to the --

MR. STRODTMAN: There's no buildings.

MR. ZENNER: The school district's property.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. So this -- this location, I think that's the existing storm-water facility here.

MS. RUSHING: You know, there is a building between there and Worley.

MR. STRODTMAN: The Administration --

MR. SMITH: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. STRODTMAN: It's further north.

MR. SMITH: Down -- down in this location here?

MS. RUSHING: No. North.

MR. STRODTMAN: Go back to the arrow.

MR. ZENNER: This building here.

MR. STRODTMAN: Back in that corner, and there's their -- that building is --

MS. RUSHING: Yeah. It looks to me like it's showing something that comes up into that area.

MR. SMITH: The plan is pretty restricted to basically within this -- the red line boundary.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: There's some trees and some topography in that corner, Ms. Rushing, that might be throwing you off a little.

MR. SMITH: And so the lines you see here are topographic lines.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. SMITH: So they're pretty tightly spaced here, so it could give the appearance of something going on, but generally it's just reflective grade.

MS. RUSHING: I'm just not used to seeing them shaded, I guess.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions of staff? I see none. As this is a public hearing, we'll go ahead and open it up to the public.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: We just ask give us your name and address and keep it to three minutes or less.

MR. SAUNDERS: I'll try. Thank you very much. Adam Saunders, 212 Hirth. The agriculture park that you have before you is a public-private partnership that's over two-and-a-half years in the making. We have a couple of speakers that are going to talk today about the different features, the components -- oh. Thank you, Robbie.

MR. PRICE: You bet.

MR. SMITH: Do you have a PowerPoint?

MR. SAUNDERS: We do.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. SAUNDERS: So again my name is Adam Saunders. The role I play in this is the campaign director for the project, the private side of this public-private partnership. I also work at the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture, which is one of the main partners on this project. The ARC that you've seen here opened its doors in 2002. They left the adjacent about ten acres open for a counterbalance to be put in some time. So this agriculture park is a really nice complement to the ARC. The ARC is -- does great work to promote a healthy lifestyle through exercise and activity, and the agriculture park we think provides a really great complement of health lifestyle with food, so promoting gardening and helping people become gardeners, providing access to fresh food through the market and through the food that's grown on site, which will be donated to the food pantry system, and education about fresh eating and cooking seasonal produce. So everything in this project, the functions build upon things that are currently happening. So the market has been on site for the last 37 years, back to when it was the Boone County Fairgrounds, and this will take it to the next level and improve its functionality. The Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture, we've been doing our work for the last eight years at our current urban farm and, as well, allows our work to scale up and do -- be a little bit bigger, a better profile site, and as well as Parks, as you know, does outstanding works -- work in the -- in the Columbia and does a great job with projects. So I'm going to talk a little bit about who is involved and the roles and kind of some of its operations, and then I'm going to leave it to other the folks to talk more about the different components. So there's four main partners on this; the City of Columbia Parks and Rec. They own the land. They will continue to own the land and be involved in the operation and management of the property. The Columbia Farmers Market is one of the main users of the site on Saturday mornings and Wednesday afternoon at this market structure. The market structure will also be able to be used throughout the week, but that kind of like anchored tenant who is going to really draw people in and create the culture for the site is the Columbia Farmers Market. The Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture, as well, will be there on site maintaining a big food -- food production area and urban farm, outdoor classrooms to teach kids about food production, about nature, and get people excited about that kind of work. Sustainable Farms and Communities, that's the third of the private groups. We're all nonprofits. They do the Access to Healthy Foods program, which doubles the value of SNAP dollars or food-stamp dollars at the market. There's a lot of interest in this project. There's other partners that we will -- that we work with and we will include with in the future, but this is the main cohort that is working on this at this point. So in terms of operation, like I said, Parks and Rec will continue to own this land and be involved in the management. Both the Columbia Farmers Market and CCUA are working on finalizing agreements with Parks and Rec about the details of utilization and those kind of aspects, scheduling and those kind of things. We currently are operating under an MOU -- a Memorandum of Understanding that passed in September of last year. The funding for this project comes from several places. Parks and Rec has committed \$400,000 through the park sales tax. That passed in 2015. The three nonprofits are operating a capital campaign to bring more private money to the table to make this project come -- come to fruition. To date, we've raised over

two and a half million. And so that's in donations and pledges. And so the fundraising began in November of last year, so it's fair to say that we've got nice momentum behind us. It's a very popular project. It's got a lot of interest from folks in the neighborhood, across town, across the country really from some of the grants and dollars that have been brought in.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Saunders, I would ask you to wrap it up. Sorry.

MR. SAUNDERS: There's strength in this public-private -- last point. There's strength in this public-private partnership that the City has this great piece of property, but they don't really want to run a market or run an urban farm. And likewise the -- the Columbia Farmers Market or CCUA couldn't ever have such a nice big piece of property, so that's -- kind of we work together to say, well, we can use -- bring programming and bring this market and help build a facility, an amenity for Columbia by partnering with Parks and Rec. So I'll leave it there. I'm -- we have a couple of other folks that are going to talk about the details, but if there's any other questions.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Saunders. Appreciate it.

MR. SAUNDERS: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. PRICE: Good evening. My name is Robbie Price; I'm representing Simon Oswald Architecture. That's at 2801 Woodard Drive here in Columbia. We're the architect of records for this project. We've been hired by the Friends of the Farm, which is this group of four entities. And staff did a great job giving you an overview of sort of the basic ideas of what's going to happen on this piece of property, but I wanted to give you just a little bit more of an insight into each of the items that's going to go into this particular plan. As you know, this is the area in yellow that's going to be utilized for these services. There's going to be a Farmers Market building. This is a four season, open-air Farmers Market building of 34,900 square feet. That will house approximately 98 vendors. Each one of those vendors will get a parking stall and an area to be able to utilize to sell their produce. Around that Farmers Market building will be an access drive that will allow them to gain access to that building. It'll be controlled by Parks and Recreation. There's also going to be a pedestrian plaza that connects the Farmers Market building to the parking that's in existence. And you also see the first lobe of two parking areas that are proposed. That first parking lot will be 38 stalls and will feed directly to the Farmers Market building. There will be an operational barn for CCUA. They've have that along with their greenhouse and storage bins for outdoor storage of mulch, soils that they'll use to amend the -- the production facilities on the site. There will be an outdoor classroom that's going to be used by CCUA and the public for educational purposes. Along with that outdoor garden and classroom, there will be an associated building that CC uses for their -- CCUA uses for their educational programs, and also there will be a playground for people who utilize this agricultural park. CCUA will have about three to three and a half acres of production area for orchards and for vegetables. They'll be able to use that and, as Adam said, they donate all of their produce to the food bank. The trails that staff talked about and the connectivity that it has to the rest of

the site, the idea is to be able to have this augment the walking trails and the sidewalk that now goes around the site. This will allow access through the site to the production areas for the public as well. And of course there are existing playgrounds and practice fields that are in existence now. One will be reserved for soccer and for lacrosse. On an ongoing basis in the future, that may be converted to -- to production areas, but we're not sure at this time. And then finally, there's about 10,000 square feet of future building that would accompany the site. About 3,800 -- 4,800 for CCUA and the Farmers Market offices, and then 5,200 as a multipurpose building much like the Reichmann Pavilion that's on Stephens Lake Park right now. That'll be used by the City for rental purposes, for meetings, and for weddings, and for whatever reasons they might have. And then lastly, if necessary -- we don't think it will be -- but we do have a secondary parking lot available that will have 42 spaces available. If indeed there is an issue with parking as this market grows and succeeds, there is the option to turn this into additional parking space. And then this last slide just shows you all of those buildings, all of the areas that are paved, that will go towards this project. And as staff said, there is a storm-water detention facility in the northwest corner that will be sized for the entire project, the entire 17.4 acres. And if you have any questions, I'll be more than happy to answer them.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Price. Any questions for this speaker, Commissioners? Can you go back to your slide that showed the additional parking? It would be, like, maybe one before that or

—

MR. PRICE: That one right there.

MR. STRODTMAN: Where is the -- where is the -- I guess I'm visually not seeing where that future parking is going to be.

MR. PRICE: Well, the access to the parking lot?

MR. STRODTMAN: Or just in general, where's --

MS. BURNS: The 42 spaces, where are they located on your slide here?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yeah. Is that the --

MS. RUSHING: The dark gray.

MS. BURNS: The shaded dark gray.

MR. PRICE: Yeah. The shaded dark gray.

MR. STRODTMAN: Oh, I see. Yes. All below there, I see a double there.

MR. PRICE: There are two arc -- arc shaped parking lots.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay.

MR. PRICE: There's -- that's the southern of the two.

MR. STRODTMAN: I'm with you. I see it. Thank you.

MR. PRICE: Right. You bet.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Additional questions? Thank you, Mr. Price.

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.

MS. SMITH: Good evening. Corrina Smith, representing the Columbia Farmers Market, 1701

West Ash. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight. My name is Corrina Smith, and I am the executive director for the Market. The Market has been at the site since 1980, which used to be the Boone County Fairgrounds. We have been a centerpiece of the Columbia community for the last 37 years and have grown and expanded during that time. Our market is a producer only market, which means that all of our vendors must grow, raise, or make what they're selling, and all of those vendors must come within a 50-mile radius of Columbia -- or of Clary-Shy Park. During the four hours that we're open on Saturday, we see on average 3,000 customers during the summer. And with our current number of stalls, we max out at 80 members every year. With the expansion and the Market shelter, we'll be able to go from 66 to 98 stalls, allowing us to accommodate more members and more customers. Our Market currently is a four-season market. We move indoors to Parkade Center during the winter months, so we're open 50 out of 52 weeks of the year. With this shelter, we'll be able to be on site at the Clary Park - Clary-Shy Park year round. Every major city has a permanent farmers market site. Even in Missouri, Springfield, Kansas City, St. Louis, and our market brings so much to Columbia currently and has so much potential to bring more. It's a centralized community space. It's a place to purchase healthy, local, fresh food. It provides benefits for low-income families, and education for children. And our market supports the local economy. It was estimated in 2016 that \$2.1 million was sold through our vendors at the market. And that money is not only going back into Boone County, but also into our surrounding small communities from our vendors that are coming within that 50-mile radius. So I fully support this project, and if you have questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Smith. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? I've got a couple for you. You mentioned the \$2.1 million was in business. I guess, what was my question on that one. Yeah. You have 98 -- or you eventually will have 98 members. There's a fee associated with that. Correct?

MS. SMITH: Correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: And that's -- you charge that to these members?

MS. SMITH: To the members, yes. Yes. They pay it.

MR. STRODTMAN: And then those fees go where?

MS. SMITH: To operational costs, staff, rent, utilities.

MR. STRODTMAN: For this -- for the complex that you're doing?

MS. SMITH: For -- for the organization to run.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. And I mean, like, \$2.1, have you ever done a study to see how far -- do people travel for this? I mean, is there something -- because I just assume that they -- you know, it's just probably very local to Columbia and people maybe aren't driving, you know, across country to come to our Farmers Market within reason?

MS. SMITH: As far as customers?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yeah. Where are coming from?

MS. SMITH: I mean, most of them are coming from Columbia and Boone County, but there are

definitely visitors that come on a regular basis, you know, if there's an event. It's kind of a secondary tourism spot. If someone is in town and their family shops there, they're going to bring those folks to the market.

MR. STRODTMAN: Got you. Do all your vendors have a business license?

MS. SMITH: They should.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any questions, Commissioners, of this speaker? Thank you, Ms. Smith.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. POLANSKY: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm Billy Polansky; I live at 1009 Coats Street. I'm the executive director of the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture. We're a 501(c)(3) nonprofit that was formed in 2009, and over the last eight years, we have transitioned from an all-volunteer group to a much larger organization with a staff of 11. And we just -- we have a great suite of educational programming that we're doing now, and we're excited to expand at this new park. The -- our partnership here is going to bring many assets and skills and experiences to this part of Columbia. Right now, we're in the eighth growing season at our urban farm off of North College. And last year, we grew about 14,000 pounds of fresh fruits and vegetables, and as Adam and Robbie have said, that everything we grow goes to the local food pantries. So in addition to growing that food, we provide lots of hands-on experiences to children and adults to get their hands in the dirt and to freak out when a carrot gets pulled out of the ground. It's a really powerful thing for a lot of -- a lot of the people that come out. And so in addition to these experiences we have on the farm, you know, our current urban farm and eventually this agriculture park is going to be our home base for everything we do out at schools and at the homes of families, so having this site is really important. And how this is going to help us grow and help us reach more people in the community is it's -- we're going to be able to triple the amount of fresh food that we grow and bring to the pantries, so we estimate about 50,000 pounds of fresh fruits and vegetables are going to be brought to the pantry from this site. The new outdoor classroom spaces are going to be able to accommodate more students, more adults, more opportunities for collaboration with Extension and other community organizations to use this site. And, finally, this site will make us and our programming more visible. We like to say that we're farming in a fish bowl because everybody can see what we're doing and we have to make it look good. And we're just -- there's going to be so many more people who are exposed to this over here by the ARC and by the Farmers Market, and it's just going to contribute to a healthier and more vibrant community. So thank you for your time and I'm happy to answer any questions.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, sir. Thank you. Commissioners, questions of this speaker? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: You said you work with the schools. Are there any plans for programs with West Middle School?

MR. POLANSKY: Yes. We -- we already do work with West and we have -- we have -- we're working on some collaboration with CPS and West is definitely in the plans.

MR. STRODTMAN: Additional questions, Commissioners?

MS. RUSHING: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: Are you connected with the Community Garden Program at all?

MR. POLANSKY: The Community Garden Coalition is a separate organization, and we sort of complement each other. Whereas they provide space for people who don't have yards, we do more of the hands-on teaching at our site and help people start gardening in their homes.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. POLANSKY: We -- we work closely with them.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Polansky. Thank you.

MR. HUFFINGTON: Good evening. My name is Gabe Huffington; I live at 705 Copse Court. I'm the Park Services Manager for Columbia Parks and Recreation. This evening, they asked me to talk a little bit about the public input process that we undertook for this project, and then also about park operations. So, first, I just wanted to highlight the public input process. We actually started this with the renewal of the 2015 park sales tax. We had put in \$400,000 for a project at Clary-Shy Park. As that ballot issues passed, we were then moved -- started to move forward with the project. Over the past year, we've held four different public-input meetings, two at Clary-Shy Park adjacent to the Farmers Market, one at the ARC, and then we also met with the vendors of the Farmers Market because we felt that was important for them to have buy-in for the project and kind of to look at it and to understand everything that we were going to go into it. Our public-input process helped us to understand a lot of things that we may need to keep and change. We discussed bike parking, the addition of more bike parking, for instance. We also looked at keeping one of those soccer fields in place. We found that was important to the community in that Ward 1 neighborhood. And then we also talked about seating and then pedestrian access to the park, specifically, to the agriculture park, as well. Other portion of this was, we found out a lot about the impact to the community and the neighborhood in that west-central neighborhood as we would start to talk about those citizens. It was overwhelming positive. We looked at different ways in terms of their access, but then also what we can provide to them. There's obviously a familiarity with the Farmers Market already being there in the ARC, but this project allows us to focus on some walking trails, a playground, keeping that soccer field, some of those recreational amenities that we wanted to keep as a Parks Department as we started to develop this agriculture park all the way around it. Three key needs that we needed in this plan that shows and it helps us out quite a bit is, number one, it solved some parking issues for us. On Saturday mornings with the ARC and our membership, we have a lot of swim lessons Saturday mornings. We also know that over 3,000 people are visiting the Farmers Market. We know that they're parking at CPS properties, walking over, but, at the same time, this 80 to 90 cars of parking spaces helps us solve some of that problem, helps us to divert some of that traffic away from the entrance to the ARC and kind of feed more to a central location and a central entrance into the Farmers Market, so it helps us solve that problem. Second is it starts to create a loop of a fitness trail around the entire property, so it's Clinkscapes, Ash, and it's through here. And in Ward 1, it's very

important for us to have something in terms of a fitness trail. Because of our access to trail systems throughout Columbia, Ward 1 is one of those areas it's very landlocked, a lot of sidewalks, a lot of residential. And so for us to be able to put in a half-mile to a mile trail and advertise that as a fitness trail, it's good for our ARC members, but it's also good for residents that live in that west-central community for us. And then lastly, it also allows for the future connection to the ARC. When we constructed the ARC, we had left purposely that north side open to expand it to additional gym space, but then also to look at group fitness. And so the storm-water calculations as part of this plan takes into account that future expansion, whether that happens in the next ballot issue or it happens ten to fifteen years down the road, we know we've got that covered in terms of our future plans for the ARC -- Activity Recreation Center. And then lastly, this will be a park that's managed much like all of our other parks, so when we look park operations hours, we know that this park will close at 11:00 p.m., opens back up at 6:00 a.m. It will follow all of the City ordinances related to Parks and Recreation, be monitored and maintained by our department. We currently maintain all of that property, so we mow, pick up the trash, take care of all of the parking lots, and so this will just be a continuation of that. We know, obviously, there's going to be some additional facilities, as well, so the Parks and Recreation Department looks at how we can utilize those when they are not occupied by our friends on the farm. So when CCUA or the Columbia Farmers Market is not on the property, how can we look at using that pavilion as a space for the community, so we would look at a movie night. You know we have a covered space now, so we're never going to rain out a movie for Parks and Recreation. We'll be able to move it to this site. But we would also look at a large family gathering, corporate outings, all of those individuals would be able to start to utilize that space when we are not using it in terms of the agriculture park, we do have some facilities that we can maximize in terms of some of our rental space and meeting the needs of some other citizens in Columbia. I'd be open to any questions at this time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Huffington. Commissioners, questions of this speaker? I've got a couple for you, Mr. Huffington. You made reference to the \$400,000 investment. Was that a one-time investment from the City?

MR. HUFFINGTON: Yeah. It's actually part of the park sales tax funding, so in FY 17, there's \$200,000 -- I'm sorry -- FY 18, there's \$200,000 and then FY 19, there's \$200,000.

MR. STRODTMAN: And then it stops in theory after that --

MR. HUFFINGTON: Correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- or there's no future. Have you done any studies as to what the net cost will be to the -- to the Parks and Rec to manage this facility, the new part?

MR. HUFFINGTON: We have looked at some costs in terms of there's obviously going to be some additional trash generation, but we actually will reduce the amount of mowing acres we have on the property, because right now, it's all grass, and so we do spend some time mowing, weed-eating, maintaining that area, and so some of that will shrink up. And also this will kind of be worked out as we start to work with our agreement with Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture because they will start to

manage and occupy some of these spaces. And so we've had some discussions in the long term of how we take care of the site in terms of what is CUA responsibilities and what is Columbia Parks and Recreation responsibilities.

MR. STRODTMAN: So who is going to handle, like, homelessness and the problems that we have in that area already? Is that going to -- who is that going fall upon?

MR. HUFFINGTON: That will ultimately be City of Columbia, between our park rangers that are part of our program, but then also the Columbia Police Department. And so just like any other park that we may have, we will analyze and look at the security of the park, and that comes back to operating hours, that comes back to security cameras, gates, how do we control the environment.

MR. STRODTMAN: In this building, are you building with CCTV because I know that you've had problems with break-ins at the ARC. Is that something that you're looking with this -- with the additional parking lot or is that something that you're going to be asking for money later for additional CCTV?

MR. HUFFINGTON: We are -- actually have a designated project in the FY 18 CIP that we're actually going to address the security cameras in the ARC parking lot. And so at that time, we've kind of looked at if there's an additional parking at that space, what do we need to do in terms of security for those lots as well.

MR. STRODTMAN: Do you have offices in other facilities in the Parks and Rec that you rent out?

MR. HUFFINGTON: Yes, we do.

MR. STRODTMAN: Stephens?

MR. HUFFINGTON: Stephens Lake Park, the Waters-Moss Memorial Wildlife Area, Rock Quarry Park, Nifong Park, we rent the Maplewood Barn.

MR. STRODTMAN: They all have offices?

MR. HUFFINGTON: So yeah. Very well versed in rental facilities and economic for individuals in our community who use our facilities in terms of they're allowed to bring food into our facilities, and then we rent them on an hourly basis, daily basis. For instance, Reichmann Pavilion, which will be a facility here will be very similar, that is rented April to October every single weekend for weddings and events. And so there is a need for additional rental space. So outside of the urban farm when we -- and agriculture park, when we look at this property, it's going to serve another need for the community.

MR. STRODTMAN: We won't get into the private sector providing part of that, but anyway. So, a last question, and I'll pose this last question. You mentioned this trash. Is that just going to go ahead and go over to the ARC -- the trash?

MR. HUFFINGTON: Well, actually, we will have dumpsters in place on site, and then we have trash crews that will run separately from the ARC, so the ARC is responsible for their own trash in terms of our Parks and Rec system, and then we have trash routes from the east and west routes that will --

MR. STRODTMAN: Will this be handled like any other park?

MR. HUFFINGTON: Correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: Other than it might get picked up more frequently based on the volume?

MR. HUFFINGTON: It'll be based on the traffic of the park.

MR. STRODTMAN: Perfect. That's my last question. Commissioners, any additional questions for this speaker? Thank you, Mr. Huffington.

MR. HUFFINGTON: Thank you.

MR. TRABUE: Chairman Strodtman, Commissioners, my name is Tom Trabue with McClure Engineering Company, offices at 1901 Pennsylvania, Columbia, Missouri. Thank you so much for considering this PD plan this evening. As you can see, what a great collaboration of folks to put this plan together. My role tonight is to address some of the technical issues of the PD Plan, and so I'm going to jump right into it. Signage was addressed a little bit in the staff report. We very carefully considered the signage in this project to make sure that it's really compatible with the surrounding properties with particular interest to the neighborhood to the east across Clinkscapes. The entrance sign off of Clinkscapes is proposed to be replaced with a slightly larger sign than that will be shared by the Farmers Market and the ARC. The size of the proposed sign is the same as is allowed under the current PD Plan. We're also proposing a standalone entrance sign off of Ash Street for the Farmers Market and associated structures. Part of the reason for that is we've been asked by emergency services to provide the addressing for all of the structures on the site off of that particular entrance, so that's really what's necessitating an additional sign there, and not really able to share with the existing ARC sign. Sponsorship signage for the market pavilion for -- from MU Health Care is proposed for the four prominent gables of the market pavilion with all of the sizes noted on the PD Plan. In addition, we're proposing very modest signage for all of the other structures, consistent with the size and type of the structure, and primarily consistent with the M-C zoning category to work within those parameters, and we appreciate staff's recommendations on how to best do that. All proposed improvements have been designed to allow for the future expansion of the ARC, as was intimated, including storm-water and landscaping features. We think that's very important as we are starting to fill the site up with this development. Parking calculations have been provided on the plan. They've been generated to match the proposed phasing of the project. And, of course, any changes that are necessitated in the phasing will be accommodated as we develop construction documents. You may have noted on the plan that we've identified controlled access on the fire lane that wraps around the market pavilion. During various operations of the pavilion, and most notably while the Farmers Market is being operated, it's our desire to really control traffic there and to make that more of a pedestrian-friendly area so that we don't have any conflicts with these thousands of people that are coming to the market and anybody trying to find a place to park. Anytime you introduce controlled access, there becomes some issues with fire department access and then garbage truck access, and we're working with those departments on those items. The Parks Department and CCUA developed a preliminary landscaping plan that is page 3 of the PD Plan that not only addresses the minimum requirements of the UDC, but we think are going to provide a really pleasant experience for all the visitors to the property. The vegetable gardens and orchards are going to be really cool. I'm really excited about this. And I think it's going to provide tremendous learning

opportunities as Billy and Adam suggested. We introduce walking trails throughout the property for this fitness aspect, but also to allow easy access to all parts of the farm operation. This is a year-around type operation, so want to make sure it's easy to be accessible. I wanted to specifically note the exceptions that we've shown in the top right-hand corner of the page 1. We appreciate the careful review of -- of the staff with regard to these exceptions, and we concur with their recommendations. We worked with them very closely to develop those. In the interest of time, I'm not going to go over them each individually, but I -- I want to make sure that you know I'm very much available here to -- if you have any questions or clarifications about any of those noted exceptions, I'd be glad to -- to answer those. Again, thank you for allowing us to present this PD Plan to you this evening. Any of our team that has already spoken are glad to answer any questions, technical or otherwise, that you might have. We think it's a great project, a tremendous public-private partnership, and -- and one that's worthy of this great city.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Commissioners, is there any questions for this speaker?
Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: Do you know financially how close you are to getting started with the actual building?

MR. TRABUE: No, I don't have the answer to the fundraising portion, but we are prepared to submit plans to the City for review in -- by October 1st. And so we hope to break ground on the first phases pretty quickly after that, after we get approval.

MR. STRODTMAN: Additional questions, Commissioners? Mr. Trabue, I've got a couple of questions. Is there just the one dumpster location?

MR. TRABUE: There is. And we've purposely located that there adjacent to the office and multipurpose building, and the reason for that is because that will be where the teaching kitchen is and that type of thing. And it's also pretty centrally located to all of the operations. As you can imagine, most of the operations of the farm, they'll be composting. And so we're going to try to control that an awful lot in that way. There has been a concern from solid waste because that dumpster is within the controlled access area.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. I was going to ask that.

MR. TRABUE: And we're -- and we're working with them to resolve that in the type of controlled access that we do. Controlled access is always a quandary because you want to make as pedestrian friendly as possible, and fire truck friendly and garbage truck friendly, but you also want to control it. And so those are some things that we're working out through the design process.

MR. STRODTMAN: Got you. A couple of questions. Is the Farmers Market shelter, is that sprinklered?

MR. TRABUE: Yes. I believe that is a requirement. Yeah. It's -- we've --

MR. STRODTMAN: But it's not -- it's open on the sides; correct -- in some capacity?

MR. TRABUE: It's -- it is -- no. That's a great question. It's a completely open pavilion, steel structure. It's going to be a beautiful structure. But because it's an all-season structure, they're going to

have screening -- plastic screens that come down in the central core to -- to keep a little bit better conditioned in the wintertime. And because of that, the fire department has required that it be a sprinklered area.

MR. STRODTMAN: Always -- always fun. The last question, I believe. Is there any fence besides what's around the dumpster enclosure? Is there any fencing planned?

MR. TRABUE: They -- there is fencing around the -- the teaching classroom and playground.

MR. STRODTMAN: A structured fence? I mean, a fence that's -- you're designing, not just a barbed-wire fence?

MR. TRABUE: Yeah. No. It'll be a structured fence. The intent, and we -- we haven't really identified exactly what that fence is going to look like. We believe it's going to be more of a -- a woven-wire type. We want to support produce on it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. But what about the gardens. I see a lot of the gardens in town, the -- you know, the community gardens are all surrounded with big things of wire, you know, I assume to keep the deer and animals out.

MR. TRABUE: Not planning for any of that at this point.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Commissioners, any additional questions of this speaker? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I notice the Farmers Market portion is identified as being phase one and phase three or phase -- yes.

MR. TRABUE: That's -- that's correct. So you'll see that the -- the central core, the very central part of the building is the phase one of the Farmers Market pavilion, the covered portion of the building. Phase one also includes all of the pavement to the east towards Clinkscapes so that part of the Farmers Market pavilion in phase one will be covered, part of it will not. And then so the future phase, we'll come back in and build the structure to the east and also build all of the pavement and structure to the west, if that makes sense.

MS. LOE: So when it says 66 stalls, phase one, that's 66 uncovered stalls?

MR. TRABUE: No.

MS. LOE: No.

MR. TRABUE: About half of those are covered.

MS. LOE: All right.

MR. TRABUE: Because the central core of the building is -- is -- of the building structure itself is phase one, as well.

MS. LOE: And to follow up on parking, as was observed earlier by one of the presenters, the school parking lot is used pretty heavily for the Farmers Market right now.

MR. TRABUE: That's correct.

MS. LOE: Is that considered in your -- it doesn't look like it's considered.

MR. TRABUE: No, it has not been considered in this. We've -- we've looked at all of the parking based on onsite parking. The parking arrangement with the Columbia Public Schools is an informal

arrangement that needs to stay that way for some legal reasons, but we're continuing to -- to look at the pathways. Certainly currently there is a pathway that goes to the West Middle School parking lot, bus parking area, and there is also the path -- and I think Ms. Rushing was referring to earlier, that goes to the Administration Building parking. That's the diagonal piece that comes and goes across to the west. And so each of those areas are being used on those Saturday mornings at the highest peak use. We think we're going to take a lot of that load off with the additional parking we're putting, but there's -- certainly there's still going to be the need.

MS. LOE: So is the parking around the market available to visitors or is that just for --

MR. TRABUE: That will be all for vendors.

MS. LOE: -- vendors?

MR. TRABUE: And we've addressed that in the parking calculations.

MS. LOE: But vendors are currently parking in the --

MR. TRABUE: Correct.

MS. LOE: -- got it -- ARC parking lot?

MR. TRABUE: And so that's going to be a bit of an offset from the current condition that we have out there. Great questions. Parking is -- is such an issue with the number of folks that we have visiting. We think most of the time, it's going to be super. We've got that one major conflict right now on Saturday morning with the ARC and the Farmers Market, but we -- we feel pretty -- pretty confident about that.

MS. LOE: I just noticed your numbers show that it's working. I'm thinking that there's already overflow, but -- okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions of this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Trabue. Any additional speakers like to come forward?

MS. GILLICH: Hello. My name is Heather Gillich and I'm a homeowner at 400 Clinkscales. And because I'm obviously going to be quite affected by this -- not so much the parking. Usually, I'm going to walk to the Farmers Market and to the ARC from that location, but I wanted to come and express my support for this project because it will dramatically increase my desire to be in my neighborhood because it will be so much more walkable, more opportunities for me to interact with my neighbors, and more access to different kinds of community gathering spaces and other places where I might be able to interact with other parts of the community that aren't necessarily available. Especially what I'm thinking about, my access to trail systems, and access to nature in that area. Right now, the Shelter Gardens in that area is the biggest available space for that and this would really increase my desire to be in that park space. So I just wanted to come and say that piece. That's all.

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

MS. GILLICH: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you for coming.

MS. LOE: So you live near this -- you live near Clary-Shy?

MS. GILLICH: Uh-huh. I live, basically, across the street and a little bit closer to Worley. Uh-

huh.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. GILLICH: Yeah.

MR. CORN: Good evening, members of the Planning Commission. My name is John Corn; I am current board president of Columbia Farmers Market, and I'm also a grower, and I've been a grower for a total of probably 15 years. And I want to talk a little bit about the health aspects that this project will hopefully improve on the City of Columbia. Here is why I support this project. We've come a long way from your mother saying eat your vegetables. We have doctors, we have nutritionists, we have health experts, we have insurance incentive plans now. We have the United States Department of Agriculture. We have any fitness guru you can see on TV who says what you eat dramatically affects your well-being. We are advised to eat fresh. We are advised to eat more local. We are advised to consume more nutrient-dense foods and food that has traveled less far. A lot of us do this already, but we, at Columbia Farmers Market, would like to reach those who are not able to do this right now. This current site that we are in has been at capacity for the last -- fill in the blank -- 15 years or counting, based on space available for vendors and also parking. But for 37 years, Columbia Farmers Market has been the exact formula for healthy eating. We are the prime source for many of the people in this region for fresh fruits and vegetables, and we have done this with just the barest resources. But we would like to do better, and we feel we can make a broader and more lasting impact on the food available and how we consume it, and we would like to be the regular stop every Saturday morning rather than the food craze that gets rediscovered every two or three years. So we're asking for your help, and we're asking you for your approval to propel this project into the coming decades. We feel like we have a very dynamic group of partners in place right now with Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture to provide the education and demonstration, with Columbia Farmers Market to provide the fresh food with another organization that was not talked about much tonight, which is Sustainable Farms and Communities that runs the Access to Healthy Foods program, and then, of course, the City of Columbia. And we feel that this project could be a centerpiece, a capstone, a must-see destination for the City of Columbia for years to come. So thank you for hearing me out.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker. I see none. Thank you, Mr. Corn.

MR. CORN: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Any additional speakers that would like to come forward? I see none, so we'll go ahead and close out the public hearing for this case, Case 17-188.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional discussion, comments, questions? I might have a quick question for staff if no one else does before my next motion. Staff, help me on bus -- bus transportation. Where does it fit into this and how does that --

MS. RUSHING: I can answer that.

MR. STRODTMAN: You can? There you go. Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: There is the two -- number two bus does a loop, but on Saturdays, it doesn't run until 10:00.

MR. STRODTMAN: Where does it stop? Where does it pick up and --

MS. RUSHING: It stops just north of West Junior High. Is that the --

MR. STRODTMAN: Do you come in from the street that you were asking about?

MS. RUSHING: What I do is I walk along that track, and then you can come up behind the Farmers Market.

MR. STRODTMAN: But there's none on the actual property?

MS. RUSHING: No.

MR. STRODTMAN: So there's no --

MS. RUSHING: There -- the -- the bus, that bus does a loop and also comes around on Broadway, so the other side of the Gerbes' area.

MR. STRODTMAN: Staff, is that -- is there something on the south side of the ARC there where your arrow -- your pointer is?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I believe that is an existing bus stop.

MR. STRODTMAN: So that would service this -- the Farmers Market component also?

MR. SMITH: Yes. Assuming that route is there and it maintains that location in the future.

MS. RUSHING: So there's a stop on Ash?

MR. SMITH: I know there's a bus-stop facility at this location, so I'd have to verify if that's on the route currently. I couldn't tell you, other than I know it's a -- it's a facility.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. I just didn't see it noted on the plan, so I didn't know if it was -- you know, I can see this being a nice opportunity for a -- you know, the bus could pull into the -- part of the production area there to help unload and such, so just trying to help get more riders. Additional -- additional discussion, Commissioners? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As to Case 17-188, I move to approve the Clary-Shy Agricultural Park PD Plan - - (inaudible).

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: And the second was Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Yes, it was.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stanton, for that motion to approve Case 17-188 with the three exceptions that are listed by staff, and seconded by Mr. MacMann. Commissioners, any discussion, comments, clarification needed on this motion that's in front of us. 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. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder.

Motion carries 9-0.

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

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

VII) COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC

MR. STRODTMAN: If there is anyone in the room that has not had a chance to speak, a couple of you over here in the blue shirts, but no -- if anyone else would like to come forward and speak, here is your opportunity. Everything is good. Thank you, guys, for the hard work with the Farmers Market.

VIII) COMMENTS OF THE STAFF

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Zenner, you've been so quiet this evening.

MR. ZENNER: That's what happens when you don't have cases.

MR. STRODTMAN: We don't mind. We don't mind.

MR. ZENNER: I appreciate the support. Your next meeting will be August 24th, same time, same place. We have a regularly scheduled work session starting at 5:30 in 1B. On that agenda, we will likely be discussing items as it relates to our planned district process that we currently have and observations that staff has made as it relates to particular concerns that have been expressed and potential solutions, as well as we may be moving forward with some of our other cleanup related matters from the UDC adoption process. You do have a number of items on your agenda for the 24th. This list just continues to grow as we continue to push projects forward, but then when we produce an agenda for you, it gets shorter. There are a number of projects here that are presented tentatively at this point that may be requested for tabling or are not going to show up on your agenda based on the fact that they don't require advertising and they're tied to a public hearing item. You have the Brooks preliminary plat. This is off of Route WW directly across from the Elks Lodge. It is associated with the Caulder-Brooks annexation, which is a public hearing item. The Caulder-Brooks annexation item and permanent zoning has a development agreement associated with it which may not be available or having been fully reviewed by the applicant and, therefore, that item, as well as the subdivision, may be delayed. The Perche Ridge preliminary plat is tied to the Perche Ridge annexation, as one can probably expect. And, again, there are certain issues associated with the annexation component of that that may necessitate both the annexation request being delayed and then the corresponding preliminary plat. So if those four items come off of your agenda, you will have three left. We have the McGrary Subdivision. This is a plat that's off of St. Charles Road proposing to create a legal lot on a A-zoned parcel and we have certain issues associated with that at this point, as well, that are yet to be resolved, so that is a tentative case. You have University Centre Subdivision. This is the Kroenke property that is directly to the south of Lucky's. This is a proposed replat vacation of a series of easements which is by separate action, and then some design modifications as it relates to street standards along Providence Road and its frontage. And finally the item that we tabled this evening is your only public hearing item potentially, and that is the Tower Drive PD Plan. And there is potentially not going to be a necessity for a design adjustment with

that, so it could just be a straight PD plan being presented to you for consideration. That is industrially zoned property or PD-zoned property for industrial purposes. Just so we can familiarize ourselves with where we are in the world, the Brooks there off of Route WW, the Perche Creek project, which is on the west side of the Perche Ridge off of Gillespie Bridge Road, and you will notice it is detached in this subdivision slide from the contiguous City limits. The intervening parcel, which is part of the annexation request, does tie this subdivision area into the City's corporate limits, but they would only be seeking preliminary plan approval on the area that's highlighted. We have the McGrary Subdivision, which is off of St. Charles Road, as I said. Then you have the University Centre Subdivision, which is there south of Lucky's. Caulder annexation, same area as the preliminary plat. The Tower Industrial Park property, which you saw this evening, which we have tabled, and then the Perche Creek annexation and permanent zoning, which is Fred Overton Development, Inc., is the very western portion was the subdivision piece, and then the intervening agricultural tract of land to the east is what connects it to the City's corporate limits for contiguous nature for an annexation. That is all we have for this evening. We thank you for your attention tonight, and we will look forward to seeing you on the 7th of -- or the 24th of August.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. And we look forward to seeing you also on the 24th.

MR. ZENNER: And enjoy on the 21st, of course.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. The eclipse.

MR. ZENNER: The eclipse.

MR. STRODTMAN: Don't miss it. Get your glasses.

MR. ZENNER: Don't miss totality.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes.

IX) COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, comments from the Commissioners? Any Commissioners?
No Commissioners.

X) ADJOURNMENT

MR. STRODTMAN: Any motion for adjournment.

MS. RUSSELL: Move to adjourn.

MS. BURNS: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Have a wonderful evening.

(The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.)

(Off the record)