

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
DECEMBER 19, 2019

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. LOE: I'm going to call the December 19, 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. It's been a while since we've had a full house. Welcome everybody.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, ma'am.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: I move to approve the agenda.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Ms. Russell, second on the agenda. You'll have another chance --

MR. MACMANN: That's all right.

MS. LOE: -- Mr. MacMann.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MS. LOE: Everyone should have gotten a copy of the December 5 meeting minutes. Any changes or edits to those minutes? Seeing none.

MS. RUSSELL: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Russell. Second by Mr. Stanton. Thumbs up approval of the meeting

minutes?

(Six votes for approval; two abstentions.)

MS. LOE: Unanimous, except for one abstention from Mr. Toohey.

MR. TOOHEY: I wasn't here.

MR. STRODTMAN: I wasn't here either.

MS. LOE: Oh, two abstentions. Sorry, Mr. Strodman.

V. SUBDIVISIONS

MS. LOE: Moving on to our cases. The first section for the evening is subdivisions.

Case Number 14-2020

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of Christian Fellowship Church (owners) for a 34-lot preliminary plat of their 35-acre property, located on the northeast corner of Chapel Hill Road and Louisville Drive. (Upon revision of the proposed preliminary plat, the advertised design adjustments are no longer necessary).

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 approval of the preliminary plat for Chapel Hill Meadows Plat 2.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Are there any questions for staff? Before we move on to -- actually, before we move on to --

MS. RUSHING: It talked about --

MS. LOE: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: -- preservation --

MS. LOE: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: -- of --

MS. LOE: Ms. Rushing? Before we move on --

MS. RUSHING: Oh, okay.

MS. LOE: -- to staff questions, I would like to ask Commissioners if they have had any ex parte on this case to please share that with us so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. Seeing none. Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: It talked about preservation of some of the trees. Do you know which trees are going to survive?

MR. SMITH: The applicant did submit a land analysis map -- and I apologize not having that in front of me here, that identified the proposed areas for the tree preservation areas. And maybe Mr. Crockett or Mr. Stephens can speak to that when they get up here.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. SMITH: They probably have a better idea of where exactly that is located. But generally it is in the common lot areas.

MS. RUSHING: And I -- you know, I was assuming it would be up in that corner where you

showed us the two new lots -- or the two lots. So I -- I will do that.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Smith, talk to me about this fire department stub that goes on the northeast. Is the fire department totally cool with that private drive split-use type access thing?

MR. SMITH: Yes. So their interest in it is to make sure that they have a fire department approved access drive that meets their requirements so that if there is an emergency call, they can navigate down the roadway, they have enough width to deploy, and they can turn around. So as far as that goes, they have reviewed it and it is acceptable.

MR. MACMANN: So I just -- points of information, I guess, mostly for me, so that would mean there would be no private parking on that street?

MR. SMITH: It generally is going to serve just like a private driveway. And the difference here is that because it is so long, they do have to meet that requirement. I think it is in excess of 150 feet, they have to have those certain specs on their driveway. We wouldn't even necessarily need it on the preliminary, but we felt it was a good illustrative tool to make sure that it was clear what would be required to develop those two lots.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I don't want to get in the arcana. That's my question for the moment. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. MacMann. Any additional questions of staff? Seeing none. We will open up the floor for public comment on this case. If you have any public comments, please come forward to the microphone. Please give your name and address for the record. You will have three minutes to speak. If you're representing a group, you will have six minutes to speak.

MR. CROCKETT: Absolutely. Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Commission. Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, offices at 1000 West Nifong. Again, as Mr. -- Mr. Smith indicated, this is a revised preliminary plat on the original plat that is in area. It is a final plat into two original lots. Again, we are platting two stub streets or two cul-de-sac streets coming off of the existing streets that are in the location. To answer your question, Ms. Rushing, with regards to the significant trees, there are a large number of significant trees or what the City classifies as significant trees, which are 20 inches and larger. A lot of those trees are located on the common lots, common lot C-2 and C-1 along the north property line as well as just to the east or the downstream side of the lake in that location. And so that is one of the reasons why we are seeking to not connect the two streets together because going through that location would require us a substantial amount of grading further down from the lake itself, thus causing the removal of a lot of those trees. And so by this configuration, it allows us to preserve a lot of the larger trees that are on the property and put them in common -- common space. With regards to your question, Mr. MacMann, with regard to the fire access. That fire access, as shown, meets the Appendix D from the Fire Code, and so we do work directly with the Fire Chief and the Fire Marshall to make sure that that is in conformance with those codes. And again, we are looking at single-family residential for the majority of

the site -- not the majority, excuse me, but for the peripheral of the site. Those lots are in substantial size and completion of what is adjacent to this property. So we are not looking to differ very much from what's already there in other neighborhoods that's in and around this location. The large lot that is currently being platted is for a church -- for the Christian Fellowship, the new location of their church building. If you have driven to the site, you'll notice that there is construction taking place. It's not construction for this residential neighborhood, but rather the church itself. So whether the preliminary plat moves forward or not, we are still in compliance with the platting regulation and the building regulation so that the church property can proceed. So I don't want any misconception that we are jumping the gun or moving ahead with the construction of this ahead of time because we certainly not. What is taking place is the construction of the church facility itself. And so that lies at the -- closer to the intersection itself. There will be some future expansions on that property if things go well, and so we have kind of allocated and planned for that. But again, this is for the residential portion. When the church purchased these properties quite a few years ago, they had this in mind. They had the idea that they wanted to come in here and build some residential units in and around their church building. They want their -- their congregation to have the first right to come in here and live close to the church, and what's not sold to the congregation themselves, it will be on the open market. So I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have. I do have Mike Acock, who represents Christian Fellowship tonight, as well as Rob Wolverton, who is a development consultant.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Are there any questions for this speaker? I see none.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any additional speakers that would like to speak on this case tonight? Seeing none. We will close the public comment period. Commission, discussion? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, since there is no discussion, I'm going to move regarding Case 14-2020 to approve the preliminary plat for Chapel Hill Meadows, Plat 2.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. We have a motion on the floor. Is there any discussion on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, may we have roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. That concludes our subdivisions for the evening.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case Number 21-2020

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Show-Me Central Habitat for

Humanity (owner), to rezone of two lots from R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) district to M-C (Mixed-use Corridor) district. The subject 0.55-acre properties are located at the southwest corner of Lakeview Avenue and Poplar Street and the existing home on the northern parcel is addressed 1311 Poplar Street.

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 M-C zoning map amendment.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Before we move on to staff questions, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had an ex parte on this case to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I don't necessarily have an issue with this unless our neighbors or the neighbors there have expressed any concerns. The closest true residential is to the northwest. You sent out your notices, Ms. Bacon. Any response, negative, positive, anything at all?

MS. BACON: I didn't get anything. There is still one residential property --

MR. MACMANN: There's a house. Right?

MS. BACON: - right directly across the street that does appear to be inhabited [sic] at this time.

MR. MACMANN: I've never --

MS. BACON: This house is either vacant or it doesn't look so great, and this property has been vacant for at least 30 years.

MR. MACMANN: I'm never sure if that house -- actually, if anyone is --

MS. BACON: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: -- there or not. But we've received no neighborhood pushback? No? Okay.

MS. BACON: We did not.

MR. MACMANN: And the area -- surrounding area, if you guys are unfamiliar with this, is offices, businesses, that type of thing. Thank you very much.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open up the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: Again, if you can please give us your name and address for the record.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I'll keep my comments fairly brief. I think Ms. Bacon did an excellent job in her staff report describing this piece of property. More importantly, basically the industrial use to the north, and I think that was one thing I really wanted to kind of hit on. I think she did a great job illustrating that, that the Grissum Building and the fleet operations of the City is the neighbor to the north. So there is a lot of industrial type uses in this area already. The reason why we are asking for M-C and not M-N is that when the ReStore does expand in the future, and we don't necessarily have immediate plans for that,

but when it does in the future, we want to have like type zoning for the existing piece of property as well as - this property as well. So we don't want to have a mixed use on the two if we do an expansion, and that's the main reason for that. So Habitat has recently purchased these two properties. They are excited to be in this area. If you have been to the previous ReStore location, it was very crowded, hard to get to. And this allows them a much better situation to serve the community. So with that I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

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

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any additional speakers on this case? I see none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commissioner, discussion? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If there is no discussion, in the matter of Case 21-2020, Crockett Engineering representing Show-Me Central Habitat for Humanity rezoning from R-MF to M-C, I move to approve.

MR. STRODTMAN: Move to second.

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

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. This brings us to our third and last case of the evening.

Case Number 22-2020

A request by Jonalyn Siemer (owner) for a conditional use permit (CUP) to allow for an accessory dwelling unit on property owned R-1 (one-family dwelling district) and addressed 103 Anderson Avenue.

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 requested conditional use permit to allow an ADU on property addressed as 103 Anderson Avenue.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Bacon. Before we move to Commissioner questions, I would like to ask any Commissioners who have had any ex parte to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information on this case before them. Seeing none. Are there any questions for Ms. Bacon? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just an admin question. Are we going to discuss the potentiality or details of an ADU overlay for the west side in work session sometime? Just an idea you guys are batting around?

MR. ZENNER: I think we -- we had batted it around and I believe, as Ms. Bacon pointed out, in our discussions internally, there are some significant downsides associated to a general overlay. And developing -- we had talked about an overlay can consist of a floating zone as well, meaning that it would -- when particular conditions exists, the zone requirements would attach to particular property. And so there is the idea of an overlay floating zone and then the CUP potentially has been discussed. The CUP allows for the greatest amount of neighborhood interaction to ensure that all neighbors are informed, and something just doesn't get built without the interaction of those surrounding neighbors to ensure that the contact sensitivity as expressed in the plans there. So to answer the question, given what we have discussed internally and what we see as the potential downside to an overlay, even though it's expressed within the plan, it's not an active project that's currently on our radar. We feel that the CUP process works effectively and is probably a more appropriate route at this point, unless so directed either through Commission or a request of Council, we'll probably continue to pursue this as the method by which to approve ADUs moving forward.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I just have a quick follow up. I agree with everything you just said and why you made the choice you made. I would just ask that if you guys do bat that around again, if it becomes a thing, I think we need to --

MR. ZENNER: We definitely would. We have to. It would require -- the establishment of overlay zones, not unlike our urban conservation districts, would require initiation. Typically, those would either come from the neighborhood itself through a percentage of its ownership. It could be initiated by City Council or through the procedures that exist within the UDC. It is possible that the Planning and Zoning Commission potentially could make a recommendation to Council to initiate as well. So we will, I think, as a part of moving forward with maybe our comprehensive planning efforts, talk about this as well as some other zoning tools that we may need to begin to look at. I know missing middle construction and things of that nature which we have touched on before in work session are things that we probably need to start to look at as it relates to our zoning strategies in order to address housing typology that we currently do not have within the City that is easily attainable. So that -- this, I think, will flow into a much broader discussion of how do we accommodate the unique demands that are being created by the ever-changing demographic that we are dealing with.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Thank -- I apologize, Ms. Siemer. I didn't mean to hijack any of your time there. Just some admin stuff going forward. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. MacMann. Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.

MS. LOE: We will open up the floor for public comments. If you have any comments you would like to make, you can come up to the podium. We need your name and address for the record. You don't have to make any comments, but if there is anything you would like to just share that can help us make a decision --

MS. SIEMER: My name is Jonalyn Siemer. I'm at 103 Anderson. I would like to build a small cottage in the back. I think it will be really consistent with the neighborhood style. And I know that we are anticipating increased density. This seems like a great way to do it. I don't know if you have any other questions or information that you want from me.

MS. LOE: That sounds fine. Are there any questions for Ms. Siemer?

MS. CARROLL: A quick question.

MS. LOE: Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: If you don't mind, can you comment on the intended use? Will this be a rental or for your own personal use?

MS. SIEMER: Yeah. Sure. No. My original plan was that it -- it is a smaller place, so I thought I might put a graduate student there, rent it out to someone that would be quiet and studious and would augment my eventual retirement funds. Yeah. That's kind of the thought. I don't know, someday when I'm a lot older, maybe I would go live there. It doesn't have any stairs, you know.

MS. CARROLL: That sounds lovely.

MS. SIEMER: Thank you. I'm excited about it, you know, if it comes to be.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? I see none at this time. Thank you.

MS. DOKKEN: Dee Dokken, 804 Agin Street. And I was so excited to see this in the newspaper. I didn't know she was planning to build this, but this is exactly what our neighborhood needs, I think, more of to increase density in a really -- in a pleasing way for us. And I was going to say maybe we should do this overlay thing because I don't -- I know she felt like she had a -- this is a barrier to the people. But I didn't realize there were downsides. So anyway, I would like to discuss it more and maybe I would put some energy into it from the neighborhood getting it started if it seemed like a good idea.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for Ms. Dokken? I seen none. Thank you. Any additional speakers? Seeing none. We'll close public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commissioner discussion? Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: So I have an issue with this. I don't think this is the way to increase density, and I think this sets a bad precedent. I think if you want to increase density, this needs to go back to R-2 -- an upzone back to R-2, not through a CUP.

MS. LOE: Do you mind elaborating on that?

MR. TOOHEY: I just think that's what the zoning classification should be for what she is intending to do with the property. That is what it was before, and so I think that's -- it ought to go back to R-2. We have a spot zoning situation with what it is now when you look at the surrounding properties, so we eliminate that spot zoning issue if it goes back to R-2 and she still can have the same use she wants to use. It's also part of the CAP plan where we want to try to increase density through zoning.

MS. LOE: Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: This is increasing density through zoning. The additional dwelling units are an

allowed use -- a conditional use in R-1. I think that this type of R-1 with an additional dwelling unit achieves the goals that are outlined in the West Area Plan, the goals that are outlined for Columbia Imagined in terms of increasing density. I support this type of additional dwelling unit in R-1, where it is an incremental step in increasing density. That's typically a little bit more manageable for the community. I have no arguments here. I think that it achieves our goals.

MS. LOE: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I agree with my fellow Commissioner. This was, number one, the West Central Neighborhood Plan kind of spearheaded this whole ADU thing anyway. And this helps the little guy, the guy that owns one house and wants to expand the use of its -- of his little piece of paradise. And we're working really hard on working these ADU codes anyway, so yeah, I'm glad to see it. This is coming to fruition being applied. So yeah, I plan to support it.

MS. LOE: Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: So I don't have a -- I think it is great that we're seeing another one of these. I hope that we have more. But I just don't think -- I just think it should be -- go back to R-2, which is -- I think is more fitting.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Well, that may be easier for certain elements in the community to have it R-2. This -- it will be easier for a process if it was R-2. This homeowner chose to downzone, and then chose to have an ADU, although it was a barrier for her, it was her barrier and her path to follow. And as Commissioner Stanton just said, this has been -- and we've seen this. We've been involved in this, you know, directly and indirectly. This has been a neighborhood driven process from the bottom up; whereas, when this neighborhood was designated R-2, that was a top down process. And this is the type of community engagement and type of community, I would say, that we would like to see. Yes, it is more difficult for -- to make that R-1, R-2 transition. It is spot zoning. We currently as a nation don't have good solution to that, and I'm quite pleased that West Ash -- the West Central Neighborhood has chosen to engage and chosen to jump through the hurtles. And I wish them more success in the future.

MS. LOE: Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Off of what Michael and Brian have just been discussing, I see the friction that Brian is referring to -- the downzone and then the additional dwelling unit. But I think both of those actions and those actions together support two goals within the plan, and thus, I support both downzoning requests and ADU requests. In fact, I -- I would like to see less friction for ADUs in R-1 if people would like to pursue that.

MS. LOE: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: And this lot just seems particularly well suited for placement of an ADU. I'm -- with, you know, some lots might not be as well suited, but this one I think would look really nice -- could look really nice on the back part of that lot.

MS. LOE: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I think I saw that 31 postcards went out on this, and there were no responses -- no negative responses and no one here to speak against it. So I am planning on supporting this.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I don't mean to cut off a good conversation, not one that we've had -- we've had this before. Unless you guys want to go on, I have a motion. I mean, do you guys want to -- all right. In the matter of Case 22-2020, a request by Jonalyn Siemer for a conditional use permit to allow for an accessory dwelling unit on her property currently zoned R-1, I move to approve.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Rushing. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? I would like to say that when the request came forward to downzone these properties, I understood the arguments and did support it. But it does -- we are working also at -- for opportunities to increase housing and looking for opportunities to infill. And there -- so there are -- Mr. Toohey's comments do strike a chord with that. And the request ran a bit contrary to some of those arguments. Still, like I said, I did support it. I do understand that the quality of these neighborhoods and the history of those zoning decisions in those neighborhoods. I find this request very ironic given the whole history of the ADU and that it was created with this neighborhood in mind and with these under -- substandard -- I think we called them originally the substandard R-2s in that they were -- couldn't take advantage of the original require-- or minimum requirements for doing a two-family dwelling unit, which is how we sort of started shaping the ADU requirements. It was to allow these small R-2s to take some advantage of their zoning. So for this lot to go from an R-2 that couldn't be a full-fledged R-2, to be an R-2 that could be an ADU R-2 to go to an R-1 and now come back as a CUP wanting the ADU is a very interesting journey. But I don't agree with Mr. Toohey that being an R-1 with a CUP with an ADU is the same as being an R-2. I mean, I believe that your requested to be downzoned from an R-2 to an R-1 because there are certain developments allowed in an R-2 that you would prefer not to have on your property and that you are specifically asking for this conditional use permit because there is a specific use you do want attached to this property, and I do support that. Any additional comments? Seeing none. Ms. Burns, roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

MS. BURNS: Eight to one, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. That concludes our cases for the evening.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Are there any public comments? Seeing none.

VIII. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Any staff comments?

MR. ZENNER: You know I can't -- can't hold back.

MS. LOE: Especially our last meeting of the year. Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: And we've only been meeting for an hour and four minutes, so let me filibuster.

You do have a meeting --

MR. MACMANN: Pat, don't do that.

MR. ZENNER: I don't want to be impeached. Okay. Your next meeting will be January 9. We will meet at the same bat time in the same bat place, but you will not have the same great food. We do have a work session that will start at 5:30 with your regular meeting at 7:00, and it is a doozy of a meeting, so we will not feed you high carbs. You do have that many items on your agenda. This is probably in the last two years the most we have had at a first meeting in January. 08-2020, which is the Moon Valley plat, I was informed of earlier today is still not ready to go, so you will only have one subdivision. And this is a revised preliminary plat down at Discovery Park. It is tied with the first public hearing 24-2020, which is a PD plan for the extension of Endeavor Drive, and then we're addressing with the revised preliminary plats some realignments of Nacona Boulevard or Nacona Parkway that have occurred since its original construction. Your -- we have a rezoning for 1001 South Providence. This is the AQ Beauty Supply building that is immediately south of the coffee shop, directly across from Hickman High School. This is a PD right now seeking M-N zoning. 34-2020 and 37-2020, when you see the map, don't do a double take. They are two separate properties. One is in the county, which is 34-2020. That is a permanent request for zoning. And then 37-2020 is immediately to the north of it on I-70 Drive Southeast, and it is currently an unaddressed and unapproved property seeking to be rezoned the same zoning classification as the parcel behind it, both owned by Ms. Culley (ph.). 38-2020 is a major plan amendment for a parcel at Discovery as well. This is the former location of CenterPointe Hospital that is immediately south of the roundabout -- the second roundabout within the project site, and it is proposed to amend the PD for the purposes of an office building and a second hotel in the location. And then your final case for the evening will be 39-2020, which is a rezoning request being presented on behalf of the Columbia Housing Authority to rezone its current administrative office building from PD and a parcel behind it that has frontage along South Providence from PD to M-OF. So the current parcel on Providence is actually zoned R-MF, if I recall correctly, and they are desiring to do a separate detached meeting space that will replace the conference room that is currently in their administrative building since their operation site has grown, they need to use the office conference room space currently, and they want to build a separate meeting space that cannot only be used for the administrative offices, but potentially also as a community center for those that are within the housing complex at that particular location. Just so we can get your teeth and your tongue tantalized with where these properties are, the Moon Valley project, as I said, this is down off of Moon Valley, but we are not ready to move that yet. The Discovery Park project, this is the preliminary plat area. This incorporates some existing development that already is in place, as well as the existing road right-of-way for Nacona Parkway. And then the

extension of Endeavor, which comes out of the signalized intersection just to the west of the overpass. Your Discovery Park project, this is a two-lot planned district plan that will then come in as a final plat, I believe in the following month. Immediately to your right then is the AQ Beauty Supply property at 1001 North Providence. And the undeveloped parcel immediately to the north of that is now where the coffee shop is built and apparently is open. As I said, don't take a double take. These are two separate maps -- one parcel in front of the other. And both of these are the permanent zoning on the left and then the rezoning of the City parcel on the right. And these are both owned by Ms. Culley and seeking M-N zoning -- or M-C zoning from their current R-S and R-1, respectively. And then our final two projects, again, the major amendment -- and I apologize, the project I foreshadowed for you was the wrong project. The hotel comes next month. This is actually a multi-family -- we have way too many things going on. This is an existing multi-family development that is being proposed to go through a major alteration. The roadway that you see on the southern portion of the highlighted area is actually on the northern boundary of the PD plan that is also part of this meeting, which is 24-2020. That roadway will serve as an access to the commercial property which comes off of the extension of Endeavor, so Endeavor will come up and frame, in essence, this parcel here. This particular private driveway will actually serve as a backdoor access to the future commercial site, and you'll see that on the PD plan. And then, of course, the rezoning for the Columbia Housing Authority. The current administrative offices are under an existing PD, which basically restricts the use of this particular parcel to just the administrative building for the Housing Authority. This particular parcel back here is zoned R-MF. They are looking to rezone both parcels consistently to an M-OF zoning classification to allow for the construction, as I said, of a free-standing conference room space on the undeveloped lot to the northeast. With that, those are our items for the January 9 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m. As we talked about today in work session, we will be back on dealing with Comprehensive Plan items at your January 9 meeting, and then that will either include a presentation and discussion of our urban service area with Dave Sorrell, with our assistant utilities director, talking about our integrated resource plan, sewer capacity and availability. We will either do that on the 9th or we will do that on the 23rd meeting, and it is dependent upon Mr. Sorrell's availability. But those are your items that we will cover in the month of January for the Comp Plan. And then as we discussed this evening, so the public is also aware of that, we have been informed and authorized to proceed forward with a West Area Plan, a joint planning effort between the City's Planning Commission and the County's Planning Commission. We will have a meet and greet, an organizational meeting of the two commissions at the beginning of February of 2020 at our February 5 -- 6 meeting. So we will have that prepared for you, and that will be just a work session as it relates to process and schedule and outcomes. So with that, we wish you a Merry Christmas. We thank you for your service. And have an enjoyable time off and we'll see you at the beginning of January.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Commissioner comments? Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: So I think we need to pick a date and actually sit down and talk about the CAP plan and how we are going to use that plan going forward, especially with the West Area Plan coming up. I think that is really important to include in how we move forward with those plans.

MR. ZENNER: We will see what Ms. Buffaloe's availability is in order to discuss that -- or a representative of her staff, and see if we can't schedule that into the meeting in January -- one of the meetings in January that we do not have Mr. Sorrell speaking at. If that is acceptable by the Commission, that is what we will do. If you have not availed yourself of that plan, we would ask them -- the Commissioners avail yourself of it. It is available online. As Ms. Bacon has pointed out during our work sessions, we do have particular friction points between the CAP's goals and objectives and those that are articulated more broadly within the City's Comprehensive Plan. So we will potentially have to address those as a part of this discussion. I believe we have also discussed previously within work session how City staff views the supplemental plans that have been created. We are in a position that the Comprehensive Plan is the overall guiding document for City land use decisions. The other supporting plans that get crafted are grafted into the Comprehensive Plan, but not necessarily taking precedent over the broader goals and objectives that were adopted for the community as a whole. And I think to Mr. Toohey's point, we need to reckon how those two plans are going to come together, I guess. And it is the Commission's decision, in my opinion, as to how you will want to utilize the CAP's recommendations. Our staff will continue to utilize the Comprehensive Plan as the guiding document for its land use evaluations.

MS. LOE: Any additional Commissioner comments? Ms. Russell?

X. ADJOURNMENT

MS. RUSSELL: Move to adjourn.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. MacMann. We are adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:11 p.m.)

(Off the record.)