

**MINUTES**

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**

**APRIL 19, 2018**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

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

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

**Mr. Brian Toohey**

**I) CALL TO ORDER**

MR. STRODTMAN: Good evening, everyone. I'd like to welcome you to the -- good evening, everyone. I'd like to welcome you to the Thursday, April 19, 2018, City of Columbia Planning and Zoning Commission regular meeting. May we have a roll call, Ms. Secretary?

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

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns.

**II) APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Zenner, any changes to our agenda?

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

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir.

**III) APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, April 5, 2018, minutes were sent to us earlier. Any corrections or notations needed to those minutes? I see none. A thumbs up? It looks like it's unanimous. Thank you.

**IV) SUBDIVISIONS**

MR. STRODTMAN: First item of the evening is a subdivision item. At this time, I would ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 18-94, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. Yes, Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Not related to this. This is just a point. I'm getting a lot of reverb back over here. Could you guys hear us okay? All right. Fine. Just, it's really bouncing back at me. Sorry to interrupt. Please?

MR. STRODTMAN: No, you're fine.

**Case No. 18-94**

**A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of the Robert G. Craig Trust (owner) for approval of a final minor plat to be known as Craig Point Plat No. 1. The .23-acre subject property is zoned R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) and is addressed as 1022 South College Avenue.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the plat as it stands allowing this parcel to become a legal lot.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Commissioners, any questions of staff? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I'm -- just curiosity. How many unplatted plots are there in the City?

MR. ZENNER: I have never gone and actually looked to find out what lots exist that are not considered legal -- a legal lot. And this is -- unfortunately, this is a part of -- if I recall correctly, this may be a part of two lots which, the way that our Code reads, development needs to be consolidated onto a single parcel. My recollection, also, however, with this is this parcel has never been actually formally platted. It may have existed as a deed lot -- a deeded lot, but never formally platted, and this particular action will formally plat the lot itself, which is required in order to have the building permit issued on it, and it also allows us then, of course, to obtain our necessary rights-of-way for utilities that we need, as well.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Loe, to partially answer your question, this was federal property at one time or at least utilized by the federal government during World War II, as was the property across the street, and I know that older properties sometimes don't have functional plats.

MS. LOE: Does that explain the Quonset huts?

MR. MACMANN: That does explain the -- and that was a chicken farm and a National Weather

Service observatory across the street. Just FYI to fill that in. Thank you. Mr. Zenner, I do have a couple questions. This property's curb cut is right at the light. Will it be a right only? How are we going to get in and out of there?

MR. ZENNER: Well, as the controlled intersection, and I'll have Mr. Crockett probably refer to this. It is actually south of the -- the curb drop is south of the actual light itself at the intersection. The plat, if I recall correctly, however, has the driveway -- and Tim may have the copy of the site plan for it that's been submitted. I'm thinking that the driveway may be being relocated. There -- what you can't see -- what you can't see there is there's one here --

MR. MACMANN: There's the curb cut.

MR. ZENNER: -- which is just north. It's across from the intersection. And this is the driveway location that is going to be maintained as it comes into the site. This down here may have been a -- it looks as though it was a little bit of a parking area. That is being abandoned as a part of the actual --

MR. MACMANN: The right-of-way?

MR. ZENNER: Well, this is -- it's in the right-of-way as it is existing today. This will not be being used for parking. The driveway location per the site plan is here, and it does come into a parking area -- a parking lot that is in front of the building, and then the building will sit in this back area. Being in the -- in between the signals and being directly across, just offset from the centerline of Hospital Drive, it's functioned this way and it will continue to function that way so that the controls of the intersection are going to allow it to be a full access as it has been. Now, the parking area, and Mr. Crockett again may have a site plan that we can share with you. The parking area itself does have adequate maneuvering room on site in order for a vehicle to, if I recall correctly, to maneuver and get back out.

MR. MACMANN: To cut around and go straight out.

MR. ZENNER: Straight out instead of having to back out.

MR. MACMANN: Right. I'll ask Mr. Crockett about ingress and egress. I do have one other question. I'm a little bit familiar with this property, and I'm -- I understand the aerial gives us kind of an odd view. The current back line or the east line of the property is the top of the hill that -- a fill that runs downhill to the next property. The property line to the south, is that anywhere close to where it actually is? That also drops off quite a bit to the property to the south.

MR. ZENNER: Based upon what our mapping software selects, those parcel boundaries are correct. The aerial photography has the buildings are actually inlaid into that may be a little bit wonky, but the boundary is correct.

MR. MACMANN: It looked a little wonky and I thank you and I appreciate that technical description because that's what it looked like to me.

MR. ZENNER: I wonder -- that's the technical term for it that we'll have.

MR. MACMANN: Technical, wonky. It shall be noted, it is wonky. Thank you for your answers, Mr. Zenner. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional questions of staff? I see none. As is in past practices, this is a subdivision hearing, but if there is anyone in the audience that would like to come forward and give us any relevant information, that is acceptable. We just ask for your name and address.

MR. CROCKETT: Members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, 1000 West Nifong. To answer your question, Mr. MacMann, yes. The access that's out there currently, as Mr. Zenner has indicated, is basically a pull in and parking area right off of College. And so, the vehicles pull in, they have to back out onto to College. Now, that is all being abandoned. We worked with MoDOT to get adequate access to the north side of the property. It's going to come in, basically, a fourth leg of that intersection that would come in. The vehicles have parking stalls in which they can pull 90 degrees into, and then they back out. So everybody who is leaving the site is, you know, basically going in a forward direction.

MR. MACMANN: Because they'll be lighted in and lighted out then?

MR. CROCKETT: I believe that's correct.

MR. MACMANN: All right.

MR. CROCKETT: I think there is a fourth leg to that intersection -- I believe. So, with that, I have no formal presentation. I didn't bring the site plan, as Pat has indicated. I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, sir. The storm-water drainage, this looks like it's fill to me.

MR. CROCKETT: This is a redevelopment, less than one acre. With not being located in --

MR. MACMANN: I -- though I'm intensely concerned, I will withdraw my question.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. It's in conformance with the storm-water regulations. Put it that way.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah.

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

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone else like to come forward that's in the audience this evening? I see none. Commissioners, any questions, additional comments? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I would like to entertain a motion.

MR. STRODTMAN: We will entertain that motion.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 18-79, Riddick Subdivision Plat 1, final plat, I move to approve.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stanton, for that motion, and Ms. Russell for the second. Commissioners, we have a motion on the table -- floor properly seconded. Is there any questions 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: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell. Motion carries 8-0.**

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns.

**V) PUBLIC HEARINGS AND SUBDIVISIONS**

MR. STRODTMAN: Moving on to our first public hearing of the evening.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Strodtman, before you move on.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: Just for the purposes of correcting the public record. It is not Riddick Subdivision, it is actually Craig Point Plat No. 1. The title on the slide is incorrect, but what is produced and advertised on the agenda was. That doesn't do anything to your vote. It's still approved eight-zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. First public hearing of the evening, Case 18-91. At this time, I would ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 18-91, 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. 18-91**

**A request by GRAM Engineering (agent) on behalf of AHJ, LLC (owner), seeking approval to rezone their 18.8-acre property located at the current terminus of Jenne Lane at Jenne Hill Drive, from PD (Planned District) to M-OF (Mixed-Use Office District). The owner intends to divide the property and develop Lot 1 with a residential care facility. A preliminary plat of the property (Case No. 18-90) is being considered concurrently with this rezoning.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval.

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, sir. Just one quick follow-up. You had mentioned the public notification. Did you get any public feedback and, if so, what was it?

MR. PALMER: I received none.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: We've discussed what the use will be on the smaller parcel, but are we also looking at rezoning the larger parcel to --

MR. PALMER: The entire parcel is to be rezoned, but, at this point, the Lot 1 is the only one we have a proposed use for.

MS. RUSHING: And the access is directly where it meets --

MR. PALMER: Where it meets Jenne Hill?

MS. RUSHING: Uh-huh.

MR. PALMER: Uh-huh.

MS. RUSHING: That's going to be the access?

MR. PALMER: An access -- we'll get to this later, but access to Lot 2 is via the stem along the north edge there.

MS. RUSHING: Right. They're just issues because there's not -- it doesn't look like there would be a second exit available off of that that --

MR. PALMER: That is true. It is completely surrounded by inaccessible property except to the north, which is already developed out and there is no way to connect to that. So, the site is limited to that one location of ingress and egress, unfortunately.

MR. ZENNER: And that -- that limitation, Ms. Rushing, will also have an impact as to the development intensity of the property. What you see here on the southern -- or on, I should say, this boundary here is the old COLT Railroad right-of-way which has been relocated to this location on the new overpass. So, the cul-de-sac that is here that would access Lot 1 and then the stem, the stem is going to restrict the balance of the property from its -- if it were to be developed residentially to a maximum of 30 units, the stem has been designed and Rusty will get into this in Case 18-90, which is the platting action, as to how that stem conforms with our other requirements for the purposes of having access and why staff's recommendation to the applicant as we went through the review process, it was made to recommend the creation of the stem lot, not an extension of the public street. Extension of the public street wouldn't have provided any additional access anyways, so even if we did a loop, we have no way of getting out to Paris Road from the back side of this property to provide through access.

MS. RUSHING: And the property to the north --

MR. ZENNER: Yes.

MS. RUSHING: -- it has a stub, but are there any plans to build a second access?

MR. ZENNER: This street right here, Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: No. The stub is kind of right in the --

MR. ZENNER: Oh. You're talking right in here?

MS. RUSHING: Uh-huh.

MR. ZENNER: Dunhill Court, where it's coming up into this parcel here?

MS. RUSHING: Right.

MR. ZENNER: At this point, we are unaware that there is any development that has been proposed for that acreage tract. Again, it's a linear -- that's a linear parcel, and I would imagine double stack single road in and probably lots on either side of it, but I can't tell from this aerial what the --

MS. RUSHING: It's a mess.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah, it is. And based upon what our standard requirements for the development would have required as a stub to undeveloped property to the north where the R-2 label is, that is why that connection is there. But not sure if that would ever yield an actual connection or if there's an intention of taking the existing improvement that's on that northern lot north of the residential subdivision and redeveloping. We just don't have anything at this point.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions of staff? Mr. Zenner, you -- just for clarification, you said that 30 units would be allowable to be built on that second parcel?

MR. ZENNER: As Mr. Palmer pointed out, the -- the M-OF does allow a residential component.

MR. STRODTMAN: Correct.

MR. ZENNER: So, it could be single, two-family.

MR. STRODTMAN: Multi.

MR. ZENNER: It could be multifamily up to a maximum of 30 units off of the single point access.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Okay.

MR. ZENNER: As an office development, circulation and square footage would drive how much intensity of an office use would be allowed on the property per the fire code. So, while -- as Rusty indicated also, the planned district, which currently restricts it really to an office project and the M-OF are very comparable. One has a plan, obviously, and one does not. And that's where probably the major difference in the zoning side of this exists. But the land uses really would be highly compatible with each other in either direction -- office use, residential care facility, or even the residential use on the balance of the remaining acreage that's not being developed.

MR. STRODTMAN: Got you.

MR. PALMER: And as is typically the case, just real quick, the fire department representative has already pointed out that turnaround or a loop road would have to be developed, or a loop drive access for that second lot whenever it is built out.

MR. STRODTMAN: All right. Last question, and you may not know. Who owns -- the COLT property, I assume, is owned by the City or by the COLT --

MR. PALMER: MoDOT. Part of it is owned by MoDOT and part of it -- I believe the -- the -- maybe it is all owned by the City now. I can't --

MR. ZENNER: I believe it is, and the rail line -- COLT, which is a division of the City, owned the rail line, if I am understanding correctly. And then the portion that is here --

MR. STRODTMAN: The A?

MR. ZENNER: -- it's got the A on it, I believe was MoDOT property which has been recently, I think, conveyed to the City. That was something, as we were going through the review process, on this particular project that was brought to our attention by our Public Works review staff.

MR. STRODTMAN: Maybe it's our chance for the City to sell it to this landowner and combine them and get some value out of it.

MR. ZENNER: That is possible. It, however, still probably would not address Ms. Rushing's concern and observation that access to another public street is really still quite challenged here, which is going to limit the ability for this isolated pocket of property to be effectively developed with a high-intensity use.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. And that's kind of what I said, that this -- that agricultural -- that A property should be combined because they're going to have even less of an access. And if it's City owned, it's you and I paying for it, so -- anyway. Any additional comments, Commissioners, or questions of staff? We'll go ahead and open it up.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STRODTMAN: This is a public hearing, so if anybody would like to come forward, we would welcome that at this time. We just ask for your name and address. And no one is required. We'll go ahead and close the public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional information, discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'd like to entertain a motion.

MR. STRODTMAN: And we will entertain it.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 18-91, I move to approve the rezoning from PD to M-OF.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: We're going for a roll this evening. We have a -- Commissioners, we have a motion that has been made by Mr. Stanton and has received its proper second by Ms. Russell. Do we have any discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS:

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

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

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

MR. STRODTMAN: Move on to Case 18-90. At this time, I would ask any Commissioner who has had an ex parte communication prior to this meeting related to this case 18-90, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. I see no one. Thank you.

#### **Case No. 18-90**

**A request by GRAM Engineering (agent) on behalf of AHJ, LLC (owner) seeking approval of a preliminary plat to be known as "Hilltop Subdivision". This subject parcel is 10.8 acres in size and is located at the current terminus of Jenne Lane at Jenne Hill Drive. A rezoning of the property (Case No. 18-91) is being considered concurrently with this preliminary plat.**

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 Hilltop Subdivision Preliminary Plat.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Commissioners, questions of staff? I have a question. Mr. Palmer, will the stem have a sidewalk?

MR. PALMER: It's -- the Code doesn't require the -- the private access to have a sidewalk.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. This is a public hearing, so I'll go ahead and open it up for such public comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.**

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone that's in the audience who would like to come forward tonight? And don't leave us hanging, come on up. But anyway, anybody who would like to come forward. If not, we'll go ahead and close the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I would like to entertain a motion.

MR. STRODTMAN: Entertain us.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 18-91, Hilltop Subdivision rezoning, I move to approve the rezoning from PD to M-OF.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Chairman --

MR. STANTON: Oh. Excuse me. I approve the Preliminary Plat.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: All right. I was reading the screen over here.

MR. PALMER: That's my fault.

MR. ZENNER: Never read the screen.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Russell.

MR. ZENNER: Trifecta.

MR. STRODTMAN: Trifecta this evening, yeah. Commissioners, we have received a motion by Mr. Stanton. It has received a second by Ms. Russell. Is there any discussion needed on this motion or clarification needed? I see none. Ms. Secretary, when you're ready for roll call.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

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

MS. BURNS: Eight 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 COMMENTS**

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone in the public like to come forward this evening and comment?

**VII) STAFF COMMENTS**

MR. STRODTMAN: We can always count on staff for some comments.

MR. ZENNER: Oh, and here's where the comedy hour begins. All right. Your next meeting is --

MR. STRODTMAN: Start the reporting going.

MR. ZENNER: Start writing, guys. Your next meeting is going to be May 10th. We will have a regular work session and, as we discussed this evening in work session, we will be overviewing the Planning Commission's recommendations on the 2019 Capital Improvement Program, and we will have another item on the agenda for discussion purposes, and I will go back and look at our minutes. There is an outstanding item the Commission wanted to discuss, and if I remember correctly, that may have been the Climate Action Study request that we have had presented to us, so that will be on for your May 10 agenda. The items on the May 10th agenda are not plenty, however, are varied, and something that we all have not seen until now. The subdivision one is not that odd. This is McGrary Subdivision Plat No. 3. This is a proposed development off of St. Charles Road requesting approval to create a couple of extra lots out of here in coordination with a Board of Adjustment lot area variance that was granted for agriculturally zoned property, and I'll show you the map here in a moment.

It is the public hearing items that I'd like to discuss with you just in general so you're prepared. As you are aware, we have a regulating plan for our downtown area as part of the new Unified Development Code, our mixed-use downtown zoning district. Amendments to that regulating plan are required to be processed in a similar fashion to zoning changes. There is a request that has been presented to the City staff in regards to an alley vacation on the west side of Providence Road near Central Bank of Boone County and the old Ambrosia Florist Shop. That segment of alley is being requested to be vacated. That alley is shown on the MDT regulating plan, and in accordance with the MDT standards, we must bring that

regulating plan amendment to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Typically, as you are probably aware, you don't normally see alley vacation requests. Those are normally items that are processed by staff directly to City Council. This is going to be a little bit different. You will have an opportunity to evaluate the alley vacation request and its impacts to facilitating the overall objectives of our street network plans and redevelopment plans for the downtown area, especially this that is on the west side of Providence Road, what is referred to on the master plan or the regulating plan as Urban General West. That is the category that this property would fall in. And corresponding to that request is the actual vote on accepting the appropriate rededication of the alley. Again, per the regulations, any alley removed must be replaced. So, you will have an opportunity to be able to evaluate that alley's relocation, which ostensibly will cover the same land area where the back entrance or the entrance to the Ambrosia Florist Shop was, which ties back into the alley segment that is proposed to be vacated.

This is going to be a different type of report that staff will prepare. We will have some additional information, I believe, also that we will be able to share with you as it relates to Council discussion on this matter at a much more -- at a higher level, but the recommendations by the Planning Commission on both the vacation and the rededication are requirements of the new UDC, and you will need to be making action on that. If you choose to do neither, the recommendation would be like any other zoning request. It would be denial of the vacation and denial of the plan amendment. However, the applicant will be present to provide justification for why they believe the alley segment should be vacated. Staff will provide pros and cons associated to that vacation, and any other technical issues as we generally do in our reporting.

Your map before you. Your St. Charles Road subdivision. This is the McGrary tract and we had approved a while back a plat that the Planning Commission had a design adjustment on for sidewalk waiver here along St. Charles Road. That sidewalk waiver was approved by City Council subject to a payment of fee in lieu. That payment has been made. This parcel has been created. There is a parcel that is back here that was previously created on Plat 1. It is being modified by Plat 3 to square up the lines and be able to get a large enough lot in the back to accommodate the two homes you see here. There is a front lot that will then be being created, as well. The lots themselves do not comply with the two-and-a-half-acre minimum that is in the zoning code, a portion of our UDC, however, the reduction in the lot areas was authorized by the Board of Adjustment through a separate action, so this plat is

generally consistent. There will be a design adjustment associated with this, and it has to deal with the creation of a stem lot less than 30 feet in width, and that's due to the recreation of the stem that is serving the existing platted Lot No. 1. The unplatted property that's surrounding Lot No. 1 or the lot that was created is actually nonplatted, therefore, the creation of a stem lot is permitted, as we just discussed with Mr. Palmer's case. However, the design adjustment for less than 30 feet in the stem is what the design adjustment will also be applying to on that lot. So we will only be covering a design adjustment on the width of the stems in the A district because it is a special district and it has a special additional width requirement. So that will be discussed and vetted with you all.

And then your two projects or the two cases that deal with the MDT plan amendment, the alley segment to be vacated here and the alley segment to be dedicated here. And we will show this in the context then of the overall regulating plan and the areas associated with each. And, again, if you all recall, as we went through the approval process, Providence Road acts as really the dividing line between the Urban General West, which has a different set of design requirements associated with it, and the more intense downtown area that has its own set of design requirements, as well. So we will be discussing the nuances of this case with you at your next meeting on the 10th. These are the only three items that you have.

If I am correct, Ms. Russell, you will be gone for this meeting.

MS. RUSSELL: Won't be here.

MR. ZENNER: So, are there any other Commissioners at this point that know if they will be gone? With that, we look forward to seeing you all at the next meeting, and we have no other comments to make tonight.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

#### **VIII) COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioner comments?

MR. MACMANN: No. I actually do have a comment.

MR. STRODTMAN: So does Ms. Loe, it looks like. Ladies first. Ms. Loe.

MS. LOE: Oh. Just -- Mr. Strodman, you had asked whether or not a sidewalk would be required on that last case, and the comment was the City would not require one. I just wanted to comment that,

depending on how the parcel were developed, if any public spaces or commercial spaces covered by ADA, ADA would require a sidewalk to the public street or sidewalk.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a quick follow-up and a comment. If that is the case, and the 25-foot stub is the ingress and egress, it might be too narrow if you take a sidewalk out of it unless you dedicate it somewhere else. Anyway, we'll cross that bridge when we get to it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be quick.

I would like to thank J-2100 for being here in force. I'm sorry we weren't more entertaining. This was rather pro forma. And I really do appreciate you guys coming out. I think it's important.

Also just a -- a note to staff, and I'll follow up with you, Mr. Zenner, later. And if you don't know quickly, that's fine. I don't want to go into it. But the way Jenne Lane comes in there and isolates, makes an island of the property that we just replatted and rezoned, that really -- I'm staring at it after Ms. Rushing's comments about our -- our lot, the City lot, and their lot. Their back lot is -- it is a mess, and I don't know if there is some way we can in the future move to change that. I'm assuming Jenne Lane went in before the new highway went in, right?

MR. ZENNER: I don't know the history behind it, so --

MR. MACMANN: I don't, either. Just -- I was just staring at that going that's a nightmare, we need to address it.

MR. PALMER: Jenne Lane came in after the 2004 rezoning, I know, so --

MR. MACMANN: Okay. So the highway does predate it.

MR. PALMER: It does, yeah.

MR. MACMANN: The layout of Jenne Lane creates an almost insoluble problem without a lot of money, but I -- well, we'll approach that at another time. Thank you for your forbearance, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional comments, Commissioners?

## **IX) ADJOURNMENT**

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

MS. RUSSELL: So moved.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Russell. Do we have a second?

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Oh. We are adjourned. Have a good evening.

(The meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.)