

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
MARCH 21, 2019

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. LOE: I'm going to call the March 21, 2019, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. LOE: Ms. Burns, may we have roll call, please.

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

MS. LOE: Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner, are there any adjustments or additions to the agenda?

MR. ZENNER: Not this evening, ma'am.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Can I get a motion to approve?

MS. RUSSELL: So moved.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. Thumbs up on approval of the agenda? Unanimous except for Ms. Rushing.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MS. LOE: Everyone should have gotten the March 7th meeting minutes. Are there any changes, edits to the minutes?

MR. STANTON: I move to approve.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Stanton.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Russell. Thumbs up on approval of the minutes? Unanimous except for Mr. MacMann. Thank you. I can't see your thumb. Thank you. There we go. Unanimous.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. MACMANN: I'm sorry. Commissioner Loe was unable to see me. I apologize.

V. SUBDIVISION AND DESIGN ADJUSTMENT

Case Number 72-2019

A request by Simon & Struempf Engineering (agent) on behalf of Atkins CPS, Inc. (owner) for approval of a one-lot final plat of IG (Industrial-General) zoned property, constituting a replat of all or part of Lots 3-5 of Block 3, Tandy's Addition, to be known as Tandy's Addition Plat 2, and an associated design adjustment to Section 29-5.1(c)(4) and Appendix A of the United Development Code regarding the dedication of additional right-of-way. The 0.55-acre subject site is located at the southwest corner of College Avenue and Wilkes Boulevard.

MS. LOE: May we have a staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends:

- I. Denial of the design adjustment to Section 29-5.1(c)(4) and Appendix A of the Unified Development Code to waive the dedication of additional right-of-way along College Avenue.
2. Denial of the final plat for Tandy's Addition Plat 2 as it is not consistent with Section 29-5.1(c)(4) and Appendix A.

Alternatively, if the Commission supports the requested design adjustment, the plat could be recommended for approval subject to minor technical corrections.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Before we move on to questions, I would like to Commissioners if anyone has had any ex parte prior to this meeting related to Case 72-2019, to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider in front of the. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? I see none. In that case, we will open up the floor to public comment. If anyone would like to -- public hearing. Sorry. Public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: Anyone who would like to come forward and provide information, please give us your name and address for the record.

MR. SIMON: Hello. Keenan Simon with SSE. Address is 210 Park Avenue. Thank you for your time tonight. We are looking for this design adjustment for the right-of-way at College Avenue. Here is a site location map of the property as Clint had also shown you. So I guess the best thing to do is probably talk a little bit about College Avenue so that you have a little bit of perspective of everything that's kind of going on in this corridor. The right-of-way width is 70 feet. The roadway width is 52 feet. There's five lanes, two north, two south, and a center turn lane. Through this process of replatting, MoDOT did not request any additional right-of-way. They -- this is mainly due to the fact that there's over 50-plus existing

homes, commercial structures, and institutional buildings that are within 25 foot of the College Avenue right-of-way or a majority -- where a majority of them are actually 20 foot within the right-of-way of College Avenue. Overall, the feasibility of widening College Avenue and capturing additional right-of-way is not practical. Here's a list of the existing structures or homes that are within 25 foot of right-of-way. Note that a majority of these are less than 20 foot from the existing structure to the right-of-way. I'm just going to kind of going to start off and go through a few of these. If you would like me to keep going, I can. If you want to interrupt me, I can also stop at any time. The first home which is at 205 North College Avenue is less than eight feet from the right-of-way width of College Avenue. 208 North College Avenue is 21 foot from the right-of-way width to the front porch. 209 North College Avenue is less than five feet from the right-of-way to the front-porch area of the structure. 210 North College Avenue is approximately 20 feet from the right-of-way width to the front of structure. 300 North College Avenue is less than 17 feet from the front structure to the edge of right-of-way.

MS. LOE: Can you focus on ones on the west side of the street?

MR. SIMON: Yeah. We can do the west side. Not a problem. 305, this is approximately twelve foot, eight inches from the right-of-way of College Avenue. I didn't have them organized into west and east. This is 307 North College Avenue, which is approximately 15 feet to the edge of right-of-way width. 401 North College Avenue is approximately 18 feet from the right-of-way width to the front face of structure. 403 North College Avenue is approximately 18 foot from the right-of-way width to the front of structure. 407 North College Avenue is approximately 18 foot from the edge of right-of-way width to the front of structure. 409 North College Avenue is approximately 20 feet from the edge of right-of-way to the front of structure. 411 North College Avenue is approximately 18 feet, not counting the bump-out. It's probably more like 14 foot from the edge of College Avenue to the edge of structure. 601 North College Avenue is approximately 20 foot from the edge of right-of-way to the edge of structure. 801 North College Avenue is approximately 23 feet from the edge of right-of-way to the edge of structure. 909 North College Avenue is approximately 15 feet from the edge of right-of-way to the edge of front structure. 911 North College Avenue is approximately sixteen feet, five inches from the edge of right-of-way to the edge of front structure. 913 North College Avenue is approximately twelve feet, ten inches from the edge of right-of-way to the edge of front structure.

MS. LOE: Was there anything else -- any other point you wanted to make?

MR. SIMON: Yeah. Yeah, of course.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. SIMON: I just -- I was just trying to at least give you a little bit of perspective of the boundaries and the corridor conditions with the existing structures that are found north of Broadway in particular. South of Broadway, you get into more of the institutional structures that are within 20 feet of right-of-way width. We'll just skip through some of these. Well, I guess what I want to go over is what the City is requesting here, what they are asking. They're asking the owner to approximately donate 10 percent of his property, and this is not including the utility easements dedications, which the owner is

willing to dedicate at the ten-foot utility requirements at the front of Wilkes and College Avenue, and also willing to donate right-of-way for truncation at the corner for any sort of future sidewalk project as well. But when you start looking at it in the grand scheme of things, they're -- they're trying to request 18 to 20 foot of right-of-way on the frontage of College Avenue when there's over 50 structures in this corridor that are already within that boundary that would be noncompliant. There couldn't -- what I -- what I'm trying to get at is if you look at this, in the grand scheme of things, it would be very difficult to do anything to expand the College Avenue corridor width. It would be similar to saying, well, we would like additional right-of-way down Broadway and, well, Broadway is -- Broadway is kind of established by existing structures that are already there. You know, the City previously agreed when we were working through this process that they would support this request because -- mainly because of the constraints of the existing College -- College Avenue corridor. I mean this is what MoDOT didn't require any additional right-of-way or anything of that nature. So I guess what we're asking for is you to support this -- this design adjustment. You know, College Avenue is an established corridor. There is numerous existing structures there within close proximity to the existing right-of-way. The future expansion of College Avenue is really not likely with this. MoDOT, who maintains College Avenue, didn't believe that there would be any necessity for acquiring additional right-of-way at the planning process. Like I said, and like Clint barely passed on, the City was in agreement with this until, you know, roughly a week ago and they changed their mind in regards to the approach of how they want to acquire right-of-way. So with that said, we ask you to support this design adjustment and with these established conditions for the College Avenue corridor, we feel like that the additional right-of-way is -- is not to be required. Thank you very much.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Simon --

MR. SIMON: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: -- I would stipulate all those addresses. I'm very familiar with the neighborhood, I've lived up there, or so really close to the edges -- edges of structure. North of Broadway, I mean, just give me your -- your characterization.

MR. SIMON: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: Using Mr. Smith's perspective, 20, 30 years from now, we have a lot of rental properties there and I'm not disparaging that in any way, shape, or form. It would seem to me, however, it's one of the places close to downtown that has not redeveloped. Would that be a fair characterization?

MR. SIMON: Yeah. I'd say there's a -- yes, a majority.

MR. MACMANN: And then which makes it prime for redevelopment?

MR. SIMON: Possibly.

MR. MACMANN: All right. And this is --

MR. SIMON: I'd say with the -- with the -- I guess the -- the business loop not having access to I-70 towards the end there, probably changes, a lot of perspective of that, but then again, there is an exit not too far away from --

MR. MACMANN: And with all that in mind, we're becoming a more pedestrian-friendly and a bicycle-friendly city. I'm -- I guess I'm going to give an opportunity here to kind of change of my mind because I see this as redeveloping at some point in the next 20, 30 years, because it did in the last 20 or 30 years with some of the same concerns.

MR. SIMON: You're saying this property specifically or the area?

MR. MACMANN: That entire strip. That entire strip all the way, you know.

MR. SIMON: You know, with the majority of the commercial property being I-G, that's very valuable, and I don't foresee that being downzoned to be apartment complexes or anything of that nature.

MR. MACMANN: Well, right now, most of those buildings that you listed are rental homes.

MR. SIMON: I'd say 70 percent of them are. Thirty percent of them are probably commercial properties, maybe a little more, thirty, forty percent.

MR. MACMANN: I just -- I would be -- my concern moving forward is that we would limit, and this is strange coming from me, I know. We would limit development opportunities there if we start giving away the right-of-way for whatever, the bicycles or utilities or, you know, widening the road. That's my concern.

MR. SIMON: I think if you look at it as a whole overall picture, you're talking about acquiring right-of-way width, if you were going to set a standard of 18 to 20 foot on that corridor, that you would be capturing, you know, maybe 30 to 40 structures that would be within that right-of-way.

MR. MACMANN: And I agree with you. I do.

MR. SIMON: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: I think that's an issue that maybe CATSO needs to address.

MR. SIMON: Possibly. It's a pretty large substantial width roadway as it is now, five lanes of traffic. I mean, that's pretty big compared to a lot the roadways that see more traffic on a daily basis, so I'm not so sure that it really would need to be widened.

MR. MACMANN: No. I stand unconvinced. I guess we're going to -- we'll have to leave that at that, but thanks for answering my question.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you.

MR. SIMON: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none, we will close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commissioner discussion?

MR. TOOHEY: I guess I have a question for staff. So -- so you did support this originally and then -- and then changed your mind?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I wouldn't dispute anything that -- that was said there. We had shared with him the past practice that we had used on these before. Obviously, the -- the final recommendation isn't done until the staff report is written, so I wouldn't necessarily characterize it as we said that the support would be in the -- in the memo, but we did tell him that that was our practice in the past and we did check with MoDOT. We had them evaluate it. And I think this kind of goes back to what I said originally because I think it's -- that realization that the evaluation that MoDOT does on these things is not the same evaluation that the City would necessarily be doing on it. Anecdotally, MoDOT does not necessarily look for additional right-of-way. They look for, I think, that minimal cross-section that they have maintain in these situations. So they do have a different approach. When they obtain property, they usually do pay for it. As a City with controlling the development and subdivision of property, we do have that right then to require dedication of right-of-way. And so it is a little bit of a different approach to that. So that's more or less the differences in the practices between us and MoDOT, so -- but I would not say that that was incorrect what he had stated, no.

MR. ZENNER: I'd like to -- I'll follow up with what Mr. Smith is saying and it is correct. Typically, our standard practice over the ten-plus years I've been here has been to rely on MoDOT, however, there has been a shift in policy as it relates as part of our review structure, this particular item before we closed out writing the final staff report was run by the Director of Public Works. The Director of Public Works directed staff to change what had been communicated and, therefore, the recommendation is at it stands, and it is likely that you will see similar recommendations moving forward with any request to waive public right-of-way dedication requirements on any plat moving forward regardless of the context. The necessity to ensure that we have adequate public rights-of-way in place to build out our full cross-section of roadways is something that the Public Works Department now is considering imperative and not to be altered. It is ultimately a Council decision should they decide that the request is inappropriate to either overturn our Commission recommendation, they do have the authority to do so, or to concur with the Planning Commission's recommendation. So this is not going to be an unfamiliar situation you will find yourself in with staff as we move forward.

MR. TOOHEY: That's all I have. Thank you for clarifying.

MS. LOE: Any additional comments? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: And if there are no other comments, I do have a motion. I move -- yes.

Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I have a question. Should we do two motions?

MR. ZENNER: Please, if you would.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: Motion to approve or deny the design adjustment should run first in your motion.

MR. MACMANN: To clarify, Mr. Zenner or Mr. Caldera, it is my intent to approve this replat with technical changes and not approve the design adjustment. So I should make a motion to deny the design adjustment first in isolation by itself?

MR. ZENNER: If you would, please. It's the best way in the public record --

MR. MACMANN: So noted. In regards to the design adjustment on Case 72-2019 -- I'm -- in a positive -- how do I state that in a positive --

MS. RUSSELL: Move to approve and then say no.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you. I move to approve -- thank you, Ms. Russell, our Robert's scholar. I move to approve, though I will vote no, the design adjustment.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. MACMANN: That -- it's to state the motion in a positive manner. Are you with me, Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: I am. Mr. Zenner, would you prefer that the design adjustment be clarified to Section 29-5.1(c)(4) and Appendix A of the Unified -- the UDC?

MR. MACMANN: I would accept that amendment.

MR. ZENNER: That would be fine. Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. Second.

MS. LOE: And seconded by Ms. Russell. Discussion on the motion? I'd just like to say that while the examples brought to our attention do indicate that there may be existing structures within the right-of-way being requested, I believe the designation of College as a major roadway was probably done after those structures were built. And in order for us to move forward, it will be a slow process, but this is how it happens. So I plan to vote no. May we have roll call, please?

MS. BURNS: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing. Voting No: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey. Motion fails 7-2.

MS. BURNS: Seven to two, motion does not carry.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Russell [sic]. Now we need a motion for denial of the final plat.

MR. ZENNER: A motion as the Commission deems appropriate. It could be denial or it could be approval.

MS. LOE: Or a second -- on the final plat. Sorry.

MS. RUSSELL: I have a comment before I do it.

MS. LOE: Yes. Ms. Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: I actually am in support of the final plat with the technical adjustments, so --

MS. LOE: I believe as it was described to us, however, the plat as drawn includes the design adjustment, so I don't think we can approve it.

MR. SMITH: Correct. Yeah. So the -- the plat as presented is not compliant with UDC regulations --

MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

MR. SMITH: -- because they are not showing the full right-of-way dedication. So my recommendation is if the motion for the design adjustment failed, the plat should also fail.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

MR. SMITH: Because it is not compliant.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay. Then following --

MR. ZENNER: You can approve, however, the Commission, as one of its four approval options, which consist of approval, denial, approval with conditions, or table, approval with conditions is the appropriate option to exert at this point. While the staff's recommendation is from a technical perspective, if it is the desire of the Commission to recommend to the Council approval of the plat subject to it being amended to reflect compliance with the Code, which would then obviously take care of itself, that's completely within your purview.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay. So I'll make a motion. I move to approve the final plat for Tandy's Addition Plat 2 with the condition that they meet the City requirements prior to Council. Does that work?

MR. ZENNER: I would just say that the Planning Commission's recommendation is approval of the plat subject to meeting the City's right-of-way standards.

MS. RUSSELL: That's what I move.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. MacMann. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion? Seeing none. Ms. Burns, may we have a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval. Voting Yes: Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey. Voting No: Ms. Burns. Motion carries 8-1.

MS. BURNS: Eight to one, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Thank you. That concludes our subdivision and design adjustment section for the evening.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case Number 69-2019

A request A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of TRS Property Management, LLC (owner) to permanently zone 1.62 acres of City M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood) from County R-S (Single-family Residential) and C-N (Neighborhood Commercial); and 1.18 acres to City M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor) from County C-GP (Planned Commercial) upon annexation. The subject site is located on the south side of East St. Charles Road at the intersection of Talon Road, and includes addresses 5200, 5202 and 5210 East St. Charles Road.

MS. LOE: May we have a staff report, please.

MR. MACMANN: Point of order. Before we proceed, I would like to amend the agenda. I did that when I read it three times, whereby Case 69-2019, instead of reading "topermanently" reads "to permanently zoned" just so everyone is clear going forward.

MR. ZENNER: So moved.

MS. LOE: Second.

MR. ZENNER: I never thought a space was so important in my life.

MS. LOE: With that adjustment --

MR. MACMANN: Thank you for indulging that point of order.

MS. LOE: -- do we need a vote on it? No. With that adjustment, may we have a staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends denial as submitted for the above stated reasons. Alternatively, staff would support a rezoning of the entire site to M-N (Mixed-use Neighborhood).

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Before we move to Commissioner questions, I would like to ask if any Commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to this meeting related to Case 69-2019 to disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider in front of them? I see none. Any questions for staff? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: So if we took the alternate and the applicant was agreeable to rezone the entire site to M-N, there would be the option to come back at a later date as they finalize their plans, whether it's a storage mart or something else, to look for the M-C zoning?

MR. SMITH: Correct. They could follow up this request with a subsequent request to upzone it then to M-C, as well, but they'd have to go through the same process generally, yeah.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just real quickly. I know you don't have this in front of you. Playing devil's advocate, if the property due east of this, which is currently in the county, were to be annexed. Say this was the property up to be annexed and rezoned, would you support that as an M-C? I'm not holding you, I'm just -- where is this -- you know, where is it going?

MR. SMITH: I -- I am cautious to speculate given that --

MR. MACMANN: I know I tossed you right in there, didn't I?

MR. SMITH: Sure. Yeah. Yeah. I think it exhibits a lot of the same characteristics as this site does. I think given the site directly to the east is -- is that limited PD zoning that is just C-1 uses, I think when you look at an orderly transition, what we prefer to avoid is having C-1 or M-N uses closer to the intersection.

MR. MACMANN: Chopping it up, getting out of order.

MR. SMITH: And then going up in intensity and back down in intensity, so you're kind of leap-frogging back and forth. We like to see a real clear transition. That's not to say it doesn't happen. It does probably happen here in town, but that would be, I think a likely recommendation, yes.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Mr. Smith, does the County C-GP allow storage?

MR. SMITH: I --

MR. ZENNER: That is not a something that we have looked into, although I would suggest that the C-GP, however, because of other plan restrictions associated with it, would be more akin to potentially our PD, C-1 type uses, so there would be controls over that that would not otherwise be there if it is zoned M-C.

MS. LOE: In layman's terms, I mean, so they have the C-G, which is general, so the difference between -- this may be a question --

MR. ZENNER: They may be able to answer that. We don't --

MS. LOE: So, we'll -- right. We'll hold off on that.

MR. ZENNER: Let's study the county's regulations as much as we study as ours.

MS. LOE: Okay. Any additional questions for staff? I see none. In that case, we will open up the floor to the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If you have any comments -- any information to share, please come forward.

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes, thank you. My name is Jay Gebhardt; I'm a civil engineer with A Civil Group. And to answer your question right at the front, C-G --

MS. LOE: Mr. Gebhardt, we need name and address.

MR. GEBHARDT: Address. 3401 Broadway Business Park Court, Suite 105.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. GEBHARDT: To answer your question right off the bat, Boone County C-G is the highest commercial zoning. It is similar to the M-C or the old C-3, and self-storage is allowed use. The thing that is preventing me from going there and submitting the plan with the self-storage on it is I don't have sewer, and Health Department has said I have to have sewer. So I'll get started here. First, I want to thank Clint and Pat for their not only fair report, but -- and that takes a lot of work to put these things together and I appreciate that. Parcel 3 seems to be the one that's in question here, so I'm not going to talk about Parcels 1 and 2 unless you have questions about them. But we're asking for M-N and staff supports them. Like I said, I can't file a zoning plan in the county because we have been required by the Health Department to connect to a City sewer. Connection to the City sewer requires annexation and annexation requires zoning, so that's why we're here. The reason we're requesting the M-C is because self-storage is not an allowed use in M-N, and it's not a conditional use in M-N, so we have to have the M-C if we have the self-storage. Since the UDC discourages planned districts, we can no longer use planned districts to limit the uses to the property. That used to be a pretty handy tool to be able to limit

the uses to just self-storage, for example, but we can't do that anymore. Instead, we have to request open M-C zoning and rely on the neighborhood protections in the UDC and the limits that the size and location of this tract impose on the property -- on the use of the property. The size is 1.1 acres. It's 142 feet wide. This is just Parcel 3, which is pretty small for a commercial lot, and it's too small to accommodate most car intensive uses allowed in the M-C district. Some uses besides self-storage that would, you know, fit would be like a vet clinic or a small assembly hall or a small bakery, but we feel like self-storage is a need in this area, so that's what we're proposing. Clint, if I could get you to put up the Stadium drawing. And this is the location. If you look at where Stadium going, it's not only taking out a lot of the commercial buildings that are at that interchange, it changes the whole dynamic in this. And something that Clint had said in the staff report, I spoke to Jake Gray, who is the City traffic engineer, and he thought that Bull Run and St. Charles Road would still be maintained as an intersection with the Stadium extension, so it would not -- it's going to change access and change it a lot, but what it does is it's created an island there between a major collector, called St. Charles Road, and an expressway. And we've got a connection to St. Charles Road on the kind of western end, and then another connection on the eastern end. The staff categorizes the uses on the east end of the property of that island as heavy commercial, and we see our proposed as a self-storage as a good transition from the zoning to the east and the requested M-N to the west of Parcel 3. So in summary, the plan to build self-storage on 1.1 acres of land. Planned districts are discouraged by the UDC, so the request is as close of a match to the existing county C-GP as possible. And the size of the parcel is self-limiting to the uses within the M-C zoning district, which could be categorized as inappropriate for this location. It is just too small to work for most M-C uses, but will work for self-storage. The Route 740 extension is a game changer for the area. It will demolish several existing commercial buildings and change the traffic patterns in the area. Our proposed self-storage will be a good transition from the heavy commercial use to the east and light commercial use to the west. So if you have any questions, I would be glad to answer them.

MS. LOE: Any questions for this speaker? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Did I hear you correctly and say you support M-N, but it doesn't support what you plan to build there?

MR. GEBHARDT: We cannot ask for M-N on that site because we can't build --

MR. STANTON: Do what you want to do with it?

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case?

MR. MURPHY: Good evening, Chair and Commissioners. My name is Kevin Murphy. I'm with A Civil Group, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. As was pointed out, the only zoning districts are -- for self-storage is M-C or I-G, the industrial district. That doesn't seem to make chance, and we would gladly

take M-N, a neighborhood-type zoning for this if that was a possibility. If you think of a self-storage unit, first of all, they're very low traffic, very low impact on the -- on the area that they're in, and they're used by homeowners that have too much stuff. They are used by rental owners that need to store thing in and such and it should technically be able to be in a neighborhood area so you don't have to drive to a heavy commercialized area or industrial area to, you know, get whatever you're storing out there or add to it or anything. And my second item is the Grace Lane boundary that was discussed. Even though Stadium Boulevard is many -- maybe many years off in the future, Grace Lane is currently being looked at by CATSO to be improved. If you can see on the right-hand side of Grace Lane on this depiction all those yellow houses in there immediately against it are being looked at being wiped out. They're taking that out of the residential in that area. Grace Lane will then turn -- basically, go to the Stadium right-of-way and turn up and take out many of that commercial area in there. So if you look at the full build-out of Stadium Boulevard and Grace Lane, taking out ten acres of commercial ground, and we're asking to put back -- it's actually 1.1 acre -- Jay said 1.1 of, you know, commercial in this area. It will also knock out 21 and a half acres of adjacent R-1 ground, so the property immediately to the south of us is R-1. It then leaves -- if you can see, two triangular pieces in between Grace Lane and the existing Grace Lane and the future Grace Lane connector to 740, and -- and then the connector to St. Charles Road. Those are approximately three-and-a-half-acre tracts right next to an expressway and Grace Lane is an arterial street, and St. Charles being a major collector, those are not going to develop into residential, and they abut our property where we're discussing this. The -- again, there's -- if you can go back to zoning graphic real quick. The -- as far as leap-frogging districts, that happens quite a bit. You -- you get multi-family in commercial areas. You get office-type uses in commercial areas where you have that stuff. Our property is located approximately 1,500, 1,600 feet from the highway right-of-way. Similar corridors like that throughout town that range from 1,500 to 5,000 feet in length of these commercial corridors. Grindstone Parkway and Providence, it's an arterial street and expressway. You've got Forum and Stadium, we have an arterial street in an expressway. St. Charles and Clark Road, just on the opposite side of here, there's 1,500 feet, a distance of commercial corridor in there. That's a collector and an arterial street connection. Range Line-Big Bear is arterial streets. Vandiver and Providence are arterial streets, and Smiley and Rangeline are -- is a collector and it's -- and an expressway. Again, these are going -- the corridors from those break points or boundary points are 1,500 to 5,000 feet in length, and again we're sitting at 1,500, 1,600 feet with this property. Again, the uses to the east of us, even though they're a planned use in the County and further to the east of the intersection of St. Charles and Grace is in the City, they're being used and have been used for decades as technically industrial type uses. Immediately to the east of us, again, in the county, part of that same C-GP zoning is a friend of mine, his family, owned a brickyard there for years -- Lake of the Woods Masonry, and that's what has been operated out of there, getting large truck in and such in and out. It's now a landscaping company, and I think they rent out to -- the other building to contractors. To the east of that, the City C-1 zoning that's in the planned district is an auto repair shop. It also serves as a contractor yard, as well.

MS. LOE: Are you willing to take some questions, Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS. LOE: Are there any questions for Mr. Murphy? I see none. Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: All right. Thank you. Have a good day.

MS. LOE: Are there any additional speakers on this? I see none. We'll close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commissioner discussion? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I'm relatively familiar with this in that I have a shop out there and we travel that quite a bit, and his characterization of those uses is -- it's spot on. It's construction yards, just east of there -- construction yards and that brickyard was there forever. Though this may be a little different philosophically than I normally am, I'm supportive of M-C south of St. Charles here, mostly because we're going to be looking at a -- the isolated triangle. And where we have one case coming to us as an isolated triangle and we've had in the past where we've got these areas that we can't do anything with, and that the neighbors don't want anything done with. We have a little bit of a chance to be proactive here. And given the small size of this particular lot, that doesn't bother me very much. One-point-one-eight acres, that's not much.

MS. LOE: Other comments? My comment would be that since the current zoning does allow it and allows it next to R-1, even though the R-1 is in City, that -- that, to me, sets something up. Also the fact that they're coming to us with a proposed project and the R-1 is not currently developed, this -- I would -- I think I would have a different reaction if we had existing R-1 developed on that site. So based on the circumstances in this case, I have to agree that the M-C does not appear objectionable. Any additional comments or a motion? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I'll break the ice here. In the matter of Case 69-2019, I move to approve as requested by the applicant.

MR. STRODTMAN: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Strodman. Any -- we have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Seeing none. Ms. Burns, may we have a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

Case Number 71-2019

A request by Engineering Surveys and Services (agent), on behalf of Last Enterprises, LLC (owner), seeking approval to rezone 7.66 acres of undeveloped land from PD (Planned District) to

M-C (Mixed-use Corridor District). The subject site is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Vandiver Drive and Mexico Gravel Road, between Vandiver and Highway 63.

MS. LOE: 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 requested zoning.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Before we ask any staff questions, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to this meeting related to Case 71-2019 to disclose that now so we all have the same information to consider in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? I see none. Good report. Thank you. In that case, we will open up the floor to public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If you would like to share any information, please give us your name and address.

MR. COLBERT: Good evening, Commissioners. Caleb Colbert, attorney, at 601 East Broadway. I'm here tonight on behalf of the applicant. I also have Ben Ross with Engineering Surveys and Services, and Paul Land with Last Enterprises. We agree that the staff report was excellent and we agree with the conclusion. Just to briefly summarize you, this property has been before this Commission before. The request was for industrial zoning, and the public testimony and the public feedback at that time was that folks would like to see more of a commercial, restaurant, retail located at this site. So we looked at the available open zoning districts and M-C fit with what folks expressed they'd like to see here, and so that's why you have this request before you this evening. And with that, I would be happy to answer any questions.

MS. LOE: Any questions? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Colbert, Mr. Ross is going to do his own presentation, or is he part and parcel to yours?

MR. COLBERT: He might be part and parcel, if you want to hit him with some questions.

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Ross, good evening. Thank you for appearing.

MR. ROSS: Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: Could you give the recorder your name and address, please?

MR. ROSS: Benjamin Ross with offices at 1113 Fay Street, Columbia, Missouri.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Ross. Just a quick question. When this was before us previously, the southern end of this property had some storm-water questions, and it's -- it butts right up against the floodway. Could you briefly tell us how you hope to address that or how we're not going to have a problem there?

MR. ROSS: Right. Could you put the map up with the blue lines? The floodway is a blue line and the floodway is a part of the FEMA flood plan that is the creek itself and the area adjacent to the creek that must be preserved to avoid increasing the 100-year flood elevation by one foot. You can see in the picture the road that the City built is actually between Mr. Land's property and the floodway, so the property that we're talking about is outside the floodway and it's actually in the floodplain fringe, which is

the area that would still be flooded by the 100-year flood, but it's not within the regulated floodway. You know, the National Flood Insurance program has regulations that are -- nationwide regulations that the City has adopted that allows development outside the floodway because they think it balances the -- the needs for, you know, environmental protection as well as economic development. So the property that we're talking about can be developed. It's included in the City ordinance that the field can be placed to raise the ground up above the 100-year storm, you know, which would be similar to, like, the road, it has already been filled in in that area. So we're planning to follow all FEMA requirements and all City requirements to develop the property in accordance with the regulations.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you. That was a question of some concern last time. I just wanted to make sure we got that on the record. Thank you, Mr. Ross.

MR. COLBERT: Any other questions?

MS. LOE: Any other questions for these speakers? I see none. Thank you. Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none, I will close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: If there's no discussion, I'll make a motion. In Case 71-2019, I move to approve the requested M-C rezoning.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Seeing none. Ms. Burns, may we have a roll call, please?

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. Strodman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey.

Motion carries 9-0.

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

Case Number 74-2019

A request by Anderson Engineering (agent), on behalf of THF Bearfield 63 (owner), seeking approval of a PD (Planned Development) plan to be known as "Bearfield Plaza Plat 1-B, Lot 1B-1 PD Plan". The plan proposes development of a Scooter's Coffee Drive-Up on upon approximately 0.5 acres in the southeastern corner of Lot 1B-1 of the Administrative Replat of Bearfield Plaza Subdivision, Plat 1-B which contains a total of 3.59-acres. The property is generally located northeast of the Grindstone Parkway and Bearfield Road intersection, with proposed access from the private drive extending between the Old Highway 63/Chinaberry Drive traffic circle and Grindstone Parkway. There are no immediate plans to develop the remaining 3+/- acres on the west side of the private drive.

MS. LOE: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Ms. Rachel Bacon of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the Bearfield Plaza Plat 1-B, Lot 1B-1 PD Plan.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Bacon. Before we move to Commissioner questions, I'd like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to this meeting related to Case 74-2019 to disclose that now so we all have the same information in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questioners for staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick, Madam Chair. Thank you very much. Help me understand because I don't know. Tiger Express is a manual or you -- or is it automated, the car wash?

MS. BACON: I've never personally used it, so --

MR. MACMANN: Both. The peanut gallery is telling me both. I was just wondering about the intensity of use across the street. That's what I was wondering. Thank you very much.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? Seeing none. We will open up the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: Please give us your name and address for the public record.

MR. WOOTEN: Good evening. Tom Wooten with Anderson Engineering. Our offices are located at 4240 Phillips Farm Road in Columbia. I prepared this plan. We are the site and civil engineer for the client. I think Rachel has done a good job covering everything, and I appreciate her help working through this process, as always, and I can answer any questions you have.

MS. LOE: Are there any questions of this speaker? I see none. I think Ms. Bacon covered everything. Thank you.

MR. WOOTEN: Thank you.

MS. LOE: If there's no additional speakers, we will close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Is there any discussion? If not, I'm going to go ahead and make a motion. Get a little nutty. Concerning the request by Anderson Engineering on behalf of THF Bearfield 63 seeking approval of a planned development plan to be known as Bearfield Plaza Plat 1B, Lot 1B-1 PD Plan, Case Number 74-2019, I would move that we recommend approval.

MR. STRODTMAN: Second.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Strodtman. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Seeing none. Ms. Burns, may we have a roll call, please?

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, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 9-0.

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Approval -- or recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. That concludes our cases for the evening.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. LOE: We do have public comments. It appears Mr. Brodsky is in an interesting position to offer us some advice.

MR. BRODSKY: Yes, hopefully. My name is David Brodsky; I live at 1920 Bridge Lane in Steamboat Springs, Colorado. I did time this today. It takes four minutes, if I could get an extra minute, I'd appreciate it. Perfect. Thank you. Good evening. David Brodsky. I currently reside in Steamboat Springs, Colorado, but I'm originally from Columbia. I graduated from Hickman as well as University of Missouri with a personal finance degree. And I also, once upon a time, sat on this body from 2006 till 2011. I think Mr. Strodman was appointed to my seat when I left. As you may -- or excuse me. When I did leave in 2011, I moved to California to start a career in the cannabis industry. So as you may guess, I am here today to make a brief comment concerning Columbia's role in the new medical marijuana program here in Missouri, and I apologize I was not here on the 7th. I was actually down in Springfield; the DHSS was holding a listening session concerning the new rules and regs. I'm currently working with a group in Springfield that's going to be applying for a product manufacturing license down in Springfield, but I am not currently working with anyone in Columbia. I am here tonight purely out of, you know, interest of Columbia. I'm staying here with my folks, so I happened to be in town, and certainly want this program to be successful for Columbia and Missouri as a whole. As you may know, Amendment 2 allows for local authorities to enact regulations covering the time, place and manner for medical marijuana business operations. Amendment 2 also calls upon the state to enact this program in an expedited manner with applications being released on June 4th and they're going to be beginning accepting applications on August 3rd, which, unfortunately, also puts the local municipalities and counties on a tight time line to develop rules and regulations for their communities. I know you guys have a lot on your plate on your work session agendas and I know you don't want to pile more on. It is, however, important to address some aspects of the potential time, place, and manner local rules sooner than later. One of the first steps for these license applications is identifying and securing real estate for these medical marijuana businesses. This step is obviously very dependent on the place -- aspect of time, place, and manner regulatory authority given to the local municipalities. Applicants will necessarily kind of need some guidance from local governments on where these businesses will be allowed in order to identify and secure appropriate locations that conform with these local regulations. If this process is started immediately, the earliest anything would potentially be passed by City Council is probably late May, sometime in June, which would give applicants only about 45 days or so to identify and secure real estate for these businesses before the applications are due on August 3rd. My suggestion would be to immediately address the place aspect of the local regulations and leave some of the more detailed time and manner regulations for later in the year. The local time and manner regulations are not really necessary to have in place for the state applications on August 3rd, and they can be addressed by the

licensees when the licenses are awarded on December 31st of this year. Hopefully, that will give the City enough time for thoughtful consideration and public discussion for appropriate time and manner regulations. As I said earlier, I'm working with a group in Springfield and have been working with their planning staff on their local regulations. They're a little bit ahead of Columbia and plan to have their local regs enacted by City Council at their April 22nd regular meeting. There's plenty of time for Columbia to catch up, but, unfortunately, there is not much time for delay either. I have provided staff with the presentation that was given by Springfield's planning director earlier this month to give some guidance to you guys on what Missouri communities are doing because I know Colorado communities isn't necessarily applicable at this point. And then I've also, which you have in front of you today, is the comments and feedback that I've given to Springfield to also help guide you guys along a little bit. So that's all I have to say. If you guys have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

MS. LOE: Any questions for this speaker?

MR. TOOHEY: I've got a question. So in your comments here with the buffer, so you think 500 feet is -- is better than 200?

MR. BRODSKY: Yeah, absolutely. So in Springfield, what staff has initially proposed is a 200-foot buffer from the schools, daycares, and churches/places of worship. That mirrors their regulations on liquor stores. They've also provided maps to their Planning and Zoning and City Council that shows 500, and I believe they -- they 1,000-foot, which is what the state maximum per the amendment. Two hundred, in my opinion, is a little bit too permissive, and you might see some public push-back on that. And then 1,000 feet is conversely a little bit too restrictive, where you really kind of see real estate prices get out of whack and, not only that, but you limit the number of parcels that would be available, but also the appropriate, you know, good retail locations.

MS. LOE: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Do you know of any restrictions as far as locations close to public parks?

MR. BRODSKY: So far, the state has not put that in there, and I am not a lawyer -- I did go to one year of law school, but I don't know if the local municipality will have that option to make things more restrictive. You can make things less restrictive, but not more so per the amendment.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Additional questions? Mr. Strodman?

MR. STRODTMAN: Do you have any knowledge on the -- is there any kind of a restriction or the number of locations?

MR. BRODSKY: In terms of how many dispensaries you might see here? So per the amendment again, there's 24 per Congressional district. So if you look at the population, I believe that is right around 750,000 per Congressional district. So if you look at Columbia's population at 125,000-ish, I think you guys are at now, you're probably going to see three to four stores allotted to the City limits. That's my best guess. The State is going to want them to be spread out so there's not any areas that are underserved.

MR. STRODTMAN: All right. Thank you.

MR. BRODSKY: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: Additional questions? I see none at this time. Thank you for coming forward, Mr. Brodsky.

MR. BRODSKY: Absolutely. Thank you, guys. If there are no more public comments, we would move on to Staff Comments.

VIII. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. ZENNER: Thank you. I'm looking on here to make sure I hit the right thing. Okay. Your next meeting will be April 4th. I'm sorry. I'm just not quite all there with it. April 4th will be your next meeting. We do have a regular work session that will be conducted. I think as I had announced at our last meeting, we will be discussing a topic that was actually assigned to the Planning Commission Monday of this week. It has to deal with streets and the public road right-of-way. This is an amendment that, unfortunately, again is needing to be acted upon relatively quickly in order to avert a potential development-related issue that has arisen as a result of the UDC, and the application of standards with a project that is actually active and in the process of obtaining building permits. Part of this text change is to address utility conflicts with the tree-planting requirements of the landscaping and buffering standards within the Unified Development Code. We will have speakers or at least other staff from our building -- our site development division, which are the folks that review development site plans, as well as handle our building and permitting process for those activities at our meeting in order to address what they have received in the way of public comment or comment from contractors that they are currently working with, the engineering profession, as well as some of our local utility providers, as well as our own utilities that we have here with inside the City. The entire meeting will be devoted to that topic only in order for us to potentially shell out and have a greater discussion of the potential text change itself. I will have for you the actual rough draft of the regulatory change that would be necessary to accomplish the amendment. If you are amenable to what is discussed in the proposal, we could, at that point, then potentially schedule it for the first meeting in May as a public hearing. If not, we could push that back probably to the latter meeting in May, but it is imperative, as I said, that the amendment get taken care of in order to avert an issue internal to the development that's being processed. Ironically, this is the first development that we have seen that is actually required to be fully compliant with the new Code, so it is an unforeseen conflict only to be fully realized as this project is about to get into full construction, both road and utility installation, and that is why it's important to take care of it. We have a number of other items that we are going to be covering as we discussed in our work session this evening. Towards the tail end of it is some of our administrative requirements that we had to discuss for the public's knowledge as well as for just reiteration with the Planning and Zoning Commission. We discussed this evening administrative procedures for establishing a series of supplemental meetings to discuss medical marijuana in order to address the issues of having place, as well as time and manner standards, adopted prior to or at least recommended for adoption to City Council prior to the June 4th enactment of the application procedures.

That public hearing would be held on May 9th for the Planning and Zoning Commission and then introduced to City Council on their May 20th meeting, final read on June 3rd, which would be one day in advance of the actual enactment of having application standards available for medical marijuana facility applicants. In order to do so, we have agreed that a series of supplemental meetings that will augment our regular April calendar will be scheduled. On April 11th, we will have a special called work session from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. that will be in meeting room 1A. On April 18th, we will have a regular Planning and Zoning Commission work session that will be in meeting room 1B. On April 25th, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m., we will have another special called work session in meeting room 1C, which is in the corridor meeting room. And then on May 2nd, we will have another special called meeting from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m., and that will be in meeting room 1A. These times, dates, and locations will be published to the City's Community Development website, along with all documentation that we will produce in preparation for these meetings to allow the public an opportunity to have access to that in advance of the Commission's discussions. These are work sessions. They are not public comment periods. And as we handle in our work sessions, they are communications between staff and the Commission in order to inform and give direction as it relates to the development of a final ordinance which would be produced and posted on May 3rd, the Friday prior to the May 9th public hearing. Until we are completed with our medical marijuana regulation review, we will suspend any additional activity as it relates to short-term rental discussion, as well as the Rock Quarry Scenic Road Overlay, with the exception of dealing with our items on the April 4th agenda. The first work session in May, which would be May 9th, we will be scheduling a round-table discussion with our Public Works utilities, as well as Parks and Recreation staff to provide you an overview of capital projects that are in the 2020 CIP that is an obligated review pursuant to your enabling legislation for the City Code. We do need to have a memo prepared and available for the -- for the City Manager and the budget retreat by the end of May, so that meeting will be devoted -- the May 9th work session will be devoted entirely to capital budget discussion and presentations. And then the May -- our second meeting in May, which I believe is May 23rd will actually be a follow-up wrap-up discussion in order to give staff direction to generate the memo that we typically forward to Council for budget retreat. Following that May 23rd meeting, our second meeting in May, we will actually get back on track hopefully to address these outstanding issues that we have yet to complete. I will not probably ask additional work session meetings; however, we may need to have them in order to move these other items out of the queue since we have had short-term rentals now for almost four months, which does need to be completed. The issue is not going away and it probably needs to be addressed quicker than later. Your projects that we do have for the May [sic] 4th meeting, however, consist of three, so our upcoming cases are two final plats with design adjustments, so they will be again public hearings similar to our one item we held this evening for Tandy. Tuscany Estates, it is a final plat for a residential development with design adjustment. And then My House, The Backyard, this is the bar that is down off of Seventh Street that backs -- goes through onto Sixth Street. It is a final plat, as well as a design adjustment. And then we have one public hearing, Cherry Hill Dental. It is a Planned District, as many of you are aware, down off of Nifong

Boulevard. They are seeking a statement of intent revision in order to increase allowable signage, as well as to amend the list of permitted uses that was previously approved on the site to allow for a restaurant with liquor sales. Liquor sales was expressly prohibited as a use on the property in general. The property consists of the bank, First Community State Bank, which is to the west, and then this particular property. If you recall, the dental office is two stories. The entire second story of this building is actually the dental office. The lower level of the property was leasable space. Just so you are familiar with where the parcels are, Tuscany Estates all the way on the left. Our center parcel is My House, The Backyard. That is two separate parcels today will become one parcel through the platting action and allow for an expansion of an outdoor entertainment venue on the backside of the existing My House, and then meet street frontage requirements with a structure on the Sixth Street side. And then on the far right-hand side, you have the dental office, the Gabois' professional offices PD plan, more commonly referred to in our office as Cherry Hill Dental. Those are the items that we have. We will keep you all informed. One thing I did forget to note with the accelerated or this supplemental meeting schedule, agendas will not be being sent on Fridays. We will send you your regular Planning Commission meeting agendas on Fridays as we always have. It will be the April 4th and the April 18th agenda. They will go out the Friday prior. For all other supplemental meetings, they will be distributed on Monday before 5:00 p.m. of the week of the meeting. That is to allow staff the opportunity to be able to digest and be able to produce appropriate amendments that may be discussed at the prior Thursday meeting. I need a weekend in order to work in the office to be able to get something that we can say on what we discussed. It is something that is provided for within your rules of procedure and it does meet City policy as it relates to the posting of meeting notices, no less than 48 hours in advance of a public hearing or a public meeting, and that is we will be well in advance of that, as well. That is -- so don't be looking for something on the Friday prior to a supplemental Thursday meeting. Look for it on Monday, and I will send that out as a reminder with the other agenda and remind you on the 4th of April. That is all we have for this evening. Thank you very much for your time and attention.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MR. MACMANN: I have a motion.

MS. LOE: Or motions.

X. ADJOURNMENT:

MR. MACMANN: That we adjourn.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Russell.

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Zenner, I hope that your supervisor recognizes your weekend work.

(The meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.)

(Off the record.)