

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
OCTOBER 19, 2017

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Ms. Lee Russell

I) CALL TO ORDER

MR. STRODTMAN: Good evening, everyone. I'd like to go ahead and call to order the Thursday, October 19, 2017, City of Columbia Planning and Zoning Commission regular meeting. May we have a roll call, please.

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

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Secretary.

II) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. STRODTMAN: Any changes to the agenda?

MR. TEDDY: None to report.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

III) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, we had sent out the October 5th regular meeting notes earlier. Are there any changes, corrections needed to the October 5th minutes? I see none. I'll do a thumbs up for approval of the October 5th minutes, and I see a full -- everybody thumbs up.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

IV) TABLING REQUESTS

MR. STRODTMAN: Our first item this evening is a tabling request.

Case No. 17-76

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of The Brooks at Columbia, LLC (owner) to annex 161.84 acres of Boone County A-R (Agricultural Residential District) zoned land into the City of Columbia and apply R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District) as permanent zoning. The

subject site is located on the north side of State Route WW, approximately 900 feet west of South Rolling Hills Road.

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

MR. PALMER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So the City is requesting on behalf of the applicant that the case be tabled until the November 9th Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to permit additional time to finalize provisions contained within a proposed development agreement associated with the annexation and preliminary plat of the subject site. The City is requesting the tabling since the applicant has already made two prior requests. It was believed at the time of the second tabling request sufficient time had been allocated to address the outstanding issues. Unfortunately, it was not. Given this case has been tabled for more than two consecutive months, it will be readvertised prior to its placement on the November 9th agenda. Additionally, property owner notification will be sent to landowners within 200 feet of the subject site. That's all I have.

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

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Palmer, are there any neighborhood associations within the bounds or near the bounds there?

MR. PALMER: I don't think there are any active --

MR. MACMANN: I couldn't think of any.

MR. PALMER: -- neighborhood associations.

MR. MACMANN: I just thought maybe you had -- were aware of any.

MR. PALMER: No.

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

MR. TEDDY: Mr. MacMann, there is a subdivision directly east and then there's some subdivisions to the south, including Vineyards, which is City. They probably have homeowner associations, but not necessarily neighborhood recognized --

MR. MACMANN: So would they get a notification?

MR. TEDDY: If they're on our list as a recognized association within 1,000 feet, we do send notification --

MR. MACMANN: That's any --

MR. TEDDY: -- to the contact person.

MR. MACMANN: -- any -- any and all of the property that might be within any --

MR. TEDDY: Any -- any neighborhood association boundary that's within 1,000 feet of rezoning, they'll get --

MR. MACMANN: All right.

MR. TEDDY: -- notice.

MR. MACMANN: That's all relatively new over there and they weren't on the old lists, and that's why I've asked my question.

MR. TEDDY: I think Mr. Palmer is correct that we don't have a City organized --

MR. MACMANN: All right.

MR. TEDDY -- or City recognized ones there.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STRODTMAN: Is there any additional questions, Commissioners? As is in past practices, if there's anyone in the audience that would like to come forward on this tabling request and give us any relevant information, you may do that at this time. I see none. Commissioners, discussion needed? Motion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 17-76, I move to table this issue until the November 9th P and Z meeting.

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

MR. TOOHEY: I'll second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Toohey. Commissioners, we have a motion to table this request, Case 17-76, to the November 9th meeting. Motion made by Mr. Stanton, seconded by Mr. Toohey. Any discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Secretary, when you're ready for a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, ma'am.

V) SUBDIVISIONS

MR. STRODTMAN: Case 17-226. At this time, I would ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 17-226, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. I see none.

Case No. 17-226

A request by Engineering Surveys and Services (agent) on behalf of Columbia Public Schools (owners) for approval of a one-lot preliminary plat to be known as "CPS Middle School Subdivision." This 63-acre parcel is located on the east side of Sinclair Road, south of Chesterfield 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 the preliminary plat.

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Two, and I'll just make them real quick. We already have a public answer to this. This entire lot, the big lot, had a hazardous material issue that was cleared; is that correct?

MR. PALMER: I believe so. It's on the other side of Sinclair and towards the southwest corner of that property.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. I just -- I needed to get that on the record. I just wanted to make sure, because we will be reviewed for that. Can you tell me more about this pipeline? This is carrying raw petroleum, gasoline? What is this carrying?

MR. PALMER: Do you know? Is it --

MR. MACMANN: I'll -- we'll --

MR. PALMER: Perhaps Mr. Carroz can explain it a little further.

MR. MACMANN: -- when we get to you. Okay.

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: I had some questions about that and runoff and stuff like that, and I'll -- I'll wait till we get the review from them.

MR. PALMER: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe?

MR. LOE: Mr. Palmer, can you discuss a little bit more just access to this site. You said that it's going to be concentrated toward the south end and I notice that the CATSO plan shows Highland Court to be connected over there. And I was just wondering can we talk about when that work is scheduled, if that's anticipated being the primary route to get to the school. If it's not, what the primary routes are intended to be.

MR. PALMER: I don't believe there is any plans for Highlands Court in association with this development at this time. The one thing that I do know is they've placed their proposed access points on their prelim plat, and that's what these three little curb cuts are for.

MS. LOE: I'm talking about access to -- from City busing. How are buses getting to the site? What routes are they taking?

MR. PALMER: So they'll be coming down Sinclair, and that was one reason for the left-turn lane.

MS. LOE: How are they getting to Sinclair? That's -- it just strikes me as currently I have some questions. Are they coming up through the residential neighborhood on Cascades? Are we going down W or K?

MR. TEDDY: I don't think we can answer that, because that's school operations. It would be via Sinclair. How they get to Sinclair, Route K, Southampton is a major road, and then Nifong is a major road. I don't know how they're going to route them through nearby neighborhoods.

MS. LOE: Right. But Nifong is on the north end.

MR. TEDDY: Right.

MS. LOE: And we're not bringing them from the north end or we are.

MR. STRODTMAN: Some would be.

MS. LOE: So the north end, we come through --

MR. PALMER: Mill Creek Elementary School is at the north end of Sinclair also, so I would assume --

MS. LOE: Okay. So if we're coming from Nifong --

MR. PALMER: -- that would be an extension.

MS. LOE: -- and Sinclair is an unimproved road, are road improvements, because there is a floodway that goes across Sinclair between Nifong. I'm just -- it strikes me that there's a lot of infrastructure work in order to make this site more tangible.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. They're going to have to do the turn lanes or turn pockets to access the site. The contribution was referenced to intersection work at the south end. The City already has a project in progress on -- or, you know, in -- in planning with planned construction in 2018 for intersection improvements at Nifong and Sinclair.

MS. LOE: As far as Sinclair?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And then Sinclair itself, it's only in the ten-plus list in our capital improvement program. There's also a sidewalk project that I'll mention. There's a gap in the sidewalk between Southampton and this site, and the City has a project, 2019, to fill that in, and then the school will build sidewalk on their frontage.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. TEDDY: I hope that covers all the --

MS. LOE: So that -- that -- that will bridge the flood issues?

MR. TEDDY: You're talking about flooding across the roadway; is that --

MS. LOE: Across Sinclair, yeah.

MR. TEDDY: Across Sinclair. I don't know if I can speak to that, but that might be under storm-water capital improvement plan. I don't think we included that in our summary, but there very well might be a project to enlarge capacity of a -- I'll see if I can look that up for you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional questions? I see none. I'll open it to the audience. If anybody would like to come forward and speak to us on Case 17-226, we would welcome you at this point. We would just ask that you give us your name and address first.

MR. CARROZ: Fred Carroz, 1113 Fay Street, Columbia, Missouri. Good evening, Commissioners. I'm here from Engineering Surveys and Services to try and provide any answers to questions you may have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Would you be able to give us the information on the pipeline? I know there was a discussion earlier that maybe -- could you clarify anything on that?

MR. CARROZ: I can. One of the pipelines is a former pipeline now. It holds a continental fiber line in it. The other one has petroleum in it, but I don't think it's used entirely much. We were able to

vacate part of the easement for that for some -- what do they call those things? There as an easement that went south from the school and the pipeline was able to give up some of their easement.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Palmer, could you move the screen back to the picture that showed the pipelines with the colors, I think, maybe? Yeah. Please. And that's the school on the top; correct -- in the center in this picture -- in the center?

MR. CARROZ: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. So the -- the -- so the petroleum pipeline to the left there that's the black line, that's the one that's used a little bit with petroleum?

MR. CARROZ: That's my knowledge, yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: And in the -- everything else is sewer. Where is the -- the abandoned line that's used as fiber?

MR. CARROZ: Parallel to the petroleum one, about five feet away.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. It just doesn't show it on this. Okay. Does that clarify your question, Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: It certainly helps. Thank you very much. And when it's my turn again, I will ask a question. I want to let someone else ask if they wish to.

MR. STRODTMAN: Additional questions, Commissioners? Any additional questions of this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I just -- just have one. Is there -- it doesn't matter who owns those. I was going to ask that question. Is there a plan in place if this pipeline leaks?

MR. CARROZ: I'm sure Magellen Pipeline has a plan in place for their infrastructure.

MR. MACMANN: That gives me a little pause. That's -- and I'm -- you probably don't have the -- the owners of the pipeline have the answer to that question?

MR. CARROZ: Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: I don't have any more questions at this time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Would you happen to know anything about the improvements proposed for Sinclair?

MR. CARROZ: Along the school's frontage, there are the required turn lanes that will be situated along the frontage of the school to require -- to allow buses to turn properly on and off Sinclair Road in regular traffic. There will be a sidewalk along the whole frontage of the school property there. But as far as outside of the school's property, I'm not aware of any others.

MS. LOE: Are you aware if the road floods at this time?

MR. CARROZ: Not at the school's property.

MS. LOE: But in the floodplain area to the north?

MR. CARROZ: To the north, to the south on Mill Creek Road --

MS. LOE: Yes.

MR. CARROZ: -- I am not aware of any flooding up there.

MS. LOE: All right. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? Thank you, Mr. Carroz.

MR. CARROZ: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone else like to come forward from the audience to speak on this matter, Case 17-226? I see none. Commissioners, questions, discussion needed, other information, motion? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I just have a comment. RE: The issues Ms. Loe brought up, and maybe this can be directed back at staff. It looks like we might have about a mile of road that we have to seriously improve and put a bridge on -- a better bridge on?

MR. TEDDY: I don't find a capital project.

MR. MACMANN: It's -- it was pretty far out, I thought. I mean, whether we have one on the CRP or not, I guess the statement I'm making is that we will have one within the five or six years if this thing goes up, you know. That's what I'm saying.

MR. TEDDY: Your concern --

MR. MACMANN: This is going to obligate --

MR. TEDDY: -- is that there will be additional traffic?

MR. MACMANN: -- this is going to obligate the City to improve that road, so that's a cost. And I'm willing to bear that cost. I just want to let know --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: -- that the City is going to pay for another bridge and improve that road all the way down.

MR. PALMER: And I believe the traffic study addressed all those issues. I'd have to pull it back up. But traffic engineers -- our traffic engineers have found that it's not necessary at this time. That may --

MR. MACMANN: Well, the TIS referenced the road at the site, and the intersection up there at Nifong. I just -- I've noticed a little personal --

MR. PALMER: But I believe it addressed the entirety of Sinclair and, hence, you get the intersection improvements at Route K. I think there --

MR. MACMANN: South?

MR. PALMER: Correct.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah.

MR. PALMER: And so I think, again, this is just speaking from memory, and I may be totally wrong, but I think it addressed the whole length and there were no other improvements requested or deemed required by the traffic impact analysis; and therefore, they weren't asked for by the traffic engineering. That's not to say that we might find else -- you know, otherwise --

MR. MACMANN: Well, I just -- you build schools. We were talking about this in the work session. You build schools and people come, and it's already a developing area.

MR. PALMER: Now, just -- I just would like to note, too, though that there is an existing sidewalk with the adjacent residential to the north.

MR. MACMANN: That's Cascades; is that what that is or not?

MR. PALMER: That is Heritage Meadows.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. Yes. Thank you.

MR. PALMER: And I believe it ends at that property line, and so they'll be connecting into an existing sidewalk network.

MR. MACMANN: I just -- I just wanted to raise those issues because it -- that's one thing that just kind of came into my head is we're going to be building some roads or improving some roads.

MR. PALMER: I think that's -- that's a big possibility, yeah.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe, did you have a question?

MS. LOE: Well, I just want to -- yeah -- follow up on that or piggyback upon that again, that I would hope that we aren't stopping our planning at the perimeter -- at the property line. I mean, we're putting funds into safe roads to schools. I would be disappointed if we're building schools outside of safe roads and not planning those safe roads at the times the schools are going in. So looking at it now, yes, there is sidewalk along part of Sinclair, but not the whole length.

MR. MACMANN: Right.

MS. LOE: So, yes, Nifong is being improved to handle that intersection, but does that include -- so I would encourage the planning process to do the complete street and take it all into consideration.

MR. TEDDY: Almost a two-mile road, so it's --

MR. MACMANN: Well --

MR. TEDDY: -- it's a tall order. I think one of the factors is that -- and it does have needs -- no doubt about it -- condition of road. It's rural style, cross-section, and that kind of thing. Traffic counts aren't really that high except probably in that Southampton to Nifong section, so that's probably why it's not getting urgent attention as a whole corridor. It's fairly low traffic counts.

MS. LOE: Well, at this time without a school --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. TEDDY: And it'll increase the traffic counts.

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. TEDDY: No doubt. Yeah.

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. PALMER: And as far as the flooding is concerned, the one area that I would be concerned about flooding that I'm aware of is north of Southampton. And so in the event that that floods, you would still have access from Southampton onto Sinclair. Also from the south from the Cascades or Route K or however that works.

MS. LOE: I think it's a bit circuitous.

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MS. LOE: So I was encouraged by the CATSO plan. I hope that is still in the plan at some point.

MR. PALMER: Yeah, I believe so.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just to follow up on this. Mr. Teddy, you were there, too; you can help me remember. The Nifong intersection is being improved as per our last Council meeting and did -- Council directed traffic to do something about the crossing at Nifong right away. Was that -- did I hear that correctly?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. There was a lot of public concern about the -- it blocked crossings.

MR. MACMANN: That's the existing school crossing, but they're putting in a roundabout?

MR. STRODTMAN: No. At Mill Creek.

MR. MACMANN: So that is a good thing, but to go to Commissioner Loe's point, that's a planning process that took place after the school went in. And I think the point Commissioner Loe and I are making is we're going to have development, we're going to have traffic, we need to -- it is a two-mile road, but five, ten years, it's going to be built out.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And it would be desirable to have sidewalk, for example, running the entire length of the thing. All I've been able to tell you is from Southampton to the school, you'll have connectivity, and that will pick up a number of neighborhood areas. But, yeah, it's not the -- it's not the full corridor treatment by any means.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I --

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Teddy, would it be treated differently if this was a commercial application that was generating some traffic?

MR. TEDDY: Typically, you do -- you do traffic improvements that are uniquely attributable to the project, so between staff and the applicant, there's been description of some adjacent improvements that will be deemed necessary to handle the traffic that this development will generate, but it's not going to address the regional need or the neighborhood need.

MR. STRODTMAN: Well, I'm kind of starting to kind of lean towards a couple of my Commissioners here that I'm -- you know, why would we put something out there that isn't addressing safety-first type of concerns? And if we know that there's going to be issues, then the school should have to pay for it. We shouldn't wait for a future development that would, you know, add to the problem, but not maybe be the only problem, you know. So I don't know. I guess I just would like to have that note added, too, is that I think we should look at this and say even though it's us, the City -- the community is paying for this project. It's going to cause problems, potentially, so let's fix it now and not wait for another user to come along and say, well, we see the problems the school is causing, so we're going to have you, User A, help us pay for the problem now when it should have been probably part of the City's package that we also are going to pay for, but -- so I don't know.

MR. MACMANN: If I may, you were saying -- if I heard you correctly, you were saying that we should -- and I know this is not you. I -- we should perhaps ask CPS to assist in their way?

MR. STRODTMAN: Well, I think they need to look --

MR. MACMANN: -- is that what you were saying?

MR. STRODTMAN: I think if -- if we can't guarantee student safety from day one, then the school needs to address that because that's their customer that they're trying to deliver to their business, the school. And if I was in their shoes in a commercial application, they would -- I would be forced to make those changes now because --

MR. MACMANN: Right. Any future developer --

MR. STRODTMAN: Would be --

MR. MACMANN: -- is going to have this issue if this is not turned into -- well, it's planned to be a major collector. Right?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: It's just not there yet.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And there -- there -- the right-of-way is shown as being contributed, so they'll take that 40-foot --

MR. MACMANN: Slice.

MR. TEDDY: -- up-width we call it.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah.

MR. TEDDY: So the right-of-way will be there. The right-of-way improvements in the form of a sidewalk across the length. There will be the turn pockets and the accesses designed to make safe entries into the site. The residential is primarily on the east side, and I think we do have an issue from a neighborhood-connectivity standpoint with what lies to the south because we don't have continuous sidewalk. We don't have bike-lane networks. So that's going to be vehicular traffic coming from near neighborhoods to the south. I mean, that'll just have to be admitted. There's still a lot of vacant property that makes up the former Sinclair Farm, so we'll get additional development. No doubt there will be some additional right-of-way contributions and, depending on end use, there will be traffic improvements contributed as part of that development process.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Teddy, are -- when we look at traffic counts for this project, is a high school or a middle school, are they treated differently? When they look at traffic counts for a middle school versus a high school, would they look at the differences or is there a difference?

MR. TEDDY: No doubt they are because, of course, high school, you have a number of high school kids drive themselves to -- to school, you know --

MR. STRODTMAN: Well, and I was thinking --

MR. TEDDY: -- most typically --

MR. STRODTMAN: -- about, like, the Friday night football game. I look at Rockbridge --

MR. TEDDY: -- activities, those kinds of things.

MR. STRODTMAN: And Rockbridge is one of the worst places to go find a parking spot on a Friday night. And it's not because of the students or the, you know, the teachers, it's the visitors, you know. And so -- and middle school is different because they're not going to have a Friday night game. But I live up off of Smiley, and the new development that Columbia Public Schools did there with the new learning school -- the Early Childhood Learning Center, I believe is what it's called, there's now about 20 cars that park on Smiley every day that are employees of CPS. So I was trying to get my arms around the traffic and if the high school -- I assume the high school would be different than a middle school, but, you know, I didn't ever expect Early Childhood Learning Center would put 20 cars out on Smiley every day, but they are. So any additional questions, Commissioners or a motion, further discussion? This is for -- I just have a clarification. Mr. Palmer, if you go another slide over where it has the -- maybe one more. This -- it shows a final plat, but our agenda shows a preliminary plat.

MR. PALMER: Oh yeah. Sorry. That's my fault. I missed that.

MR. STRODTMAN: It is a preliminary plat?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Yeah. Sorry.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Just want to make sure that we're voting on the right thing.

Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 17-190 --

MR. PALMER: That's the incorrect one, too. Sorry. I missed that -- that whole label up there.

Use that top --

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: There we go.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 17-226, I move to approve the preliminary plat.

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

MS. BURNS: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. We have a motion that has been made by Mr. Stanton and seconded by Ms. Burns approving the request of a preliminary plat for Case 17-226. Is there any additional discussion or information needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Secretary, when you're ready for a roll call.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Planning and Zoning's recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.

VI) PUBLIC COMMENTS

MR. STRODTMAN: Would -- anybody in the public who would like to come forward and give us

comments, you're welcome to do that at this time.

VII) STAFF COMMENTS

MR. STRODTMAN: Is there any comments from our fine staff?

MR. PALMER: We have --

MR. TEDDY: Do you want to give us the upcoming cases?

MR. PALMER: Sure. I believe that's in here somewhere. All right. So you're upcoming agenda items for November 9th will be the Brooks Plat II. It's another preliminary plat. Same with Mill Creek Meadows Plat I. Quaker Oats Plat I is a final plat, and Lenoir Subdivision Plat II is another final plat. One public hearing item at the next meeting is the Caulder annexation. I believe that's along with the Brooks Plat II preliminary plat for the same property you've seen before. That's your tabled item from tonight, I believe, if I remember correctly. There's -- on the left is the Brooks Preliminary Plat II. Mill Creek Meadows is on the right. Sorry. I don't have all the same color commentaries as Mr. Zenner on these. But Quaker Oats Plat I along Paris Road there on the left. On the right is Lenoir Subdivision, that's located on New Haven. And then finally the public hearing item, the Brooks annexation and permanent zoning. So that's all we have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Short and sweet. Thank you.

VIII) COMMISSION COMMENTS

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any comments from Commissioners? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real briefly. Just to follow up again on what you and I and Commissioner Loe spoke of and to encourage staff, we need a little more planning on this. I mean, it meets everything within its bubble, but as it's a school and we don't -- we do not have an area plan, there are things we might need to consider more broadly. And I don't know how we do that because, I mean, you guys did your due diligence. You did what you were supposed to do and we're all within here, but as Commissioner Loe and the rest of us mentioned, this is an area impact event. And we crossed the I's and dotted the T's, but we all are sitting here going, you know what, we didn't -- you know, everyone did their job, but we didn't include enough in that. It's just a -- an ongoing commentary.

MR. TEDDY: Need to exact more; is that the --

MR. MACMANN: Well, an area plan would help, and it really helped out, you know, at Battle, and I know it's an expensive multi-year process. And CPS has a better budget than we do, and we need to -- we have this -- these Zero Vision things coming up and we're doing some retro planning with Mill Creek already. And like I said, everything -- Mill Creek met its thing, we met its thing, the Nifong intersection met its thing, but the area -- we're going to have backfill and it's going to be expensive to plan and do rather than doing it now. Right now, the cheapest way to do it would be just make Sinclair a great road right now. We don't have the money for it; it's not in the plan. I appreciate that, but there's issues. Let's -- more -- more forethought.

MR. STRODTMAN: To me, I was just -- I will just echo it a little bit more to Mr. MacMann. To me, it just seems we're pushing a problem down the road. We're kicking the stone down the road.

MR. MACMANN: And it's going to be more expensive.

MR. STRODTMAN: And it's going to be more expensive, and it's going to be probably on a private individual's –

MR. MACMANN: Or on us, the taxpayers.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- or us again, as a public entity. And these are children. These are, you know, young children, and it is a much bigger discussion, because this is a regional community draw, and not just a small business that fits within its area. It's going to have a draw and impact.

MR. MACMANN: Just a little bit -- this is going to grow, too.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yeah. So, I think just a discussion that CPS and staff should just continue to have discussion, forethought, so that we're not knowingly creating a problem and trying to pass it down the road for someone else later to fix because we don't have the dollars today. And we may want to reconsider our budget for the school to fix the problems now, but easier said than done. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Is everybody ready? Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: Motion for adjournment?

MR. STANTON: We need to -- we need to make a win-win, and we need to make a deal, because you're right. Because if this was a commercial issue, we would try to make a deal with the commercial developer –

MR. MACMANN: Entity. Yeah.

MR. STANTON: -- to improve infrastructure. So, yeah, we need to make a deal.

MR. STRODTMAN: Even though it's our pocket that's painful --

MR. STANTON: Yeah. It's our pocket, but --

MR. STRODTMAN: But we wanted to --

MR. STANTON: -- let's save some money now.

MR. STRODTMAN: Let's do it right. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: It's our pocket, but it's our community and this is our opportunity to really put in place what we feel should be done for our children -- our community's children and our roads. This is the way to do it the way we think it should be done, and they've picked a location that is a bit more on the outskirts and has less infrastructure in place, so there's an opportunity to do some of this.

MR. STRODTMAN: Good. Any additional discussion, Commissioners?

IX) ADJOURNMENT

MR. STRODTMAN: If not, I would look for a motion for adjournment.

MR. STANTON: I move to adjourn.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton. Do we have a second?

MS. LOE: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe, thank you. All in favor, thumbs up. I see all thumbs up.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Have a nice evening. Meeting adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.)
(Off the record.)