

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
December 10, 2020
Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1st Floor City Hall**

I. Call to Order

- Commissioners Present - Burns, Carroll, Stanton, Toohey, Loe, McMann, Geuea Jones and Rushing
- Commissioners Absent – Russell
- Staff Present – Bacon, Kelley, Bauer, Smith, Teddy, Thompson, and Zenner.

II. Introductions

III. Approval of Agenda

- Meeting Agenda adopted as presented unanimously.

IV. Approval of Minutes

- November 19, 2020 work session minutes were adopted as presented unanimously.

V. Old Business

UDC Text Amendments Project, Phase 1 (Follow-up)

Mr. Smith introduced the topic. He said this was the third review of the proposed UDC text amendments. He said the amendments are now numbered #A1-#A17. He said his intent was to review the remaining amendments that have not been covered during a previous work session first, which will be amendments #A12-#A17. Once discussion on those amendments are complete, then there can be additional discussion on the rest of the amendments. He said text now appearing in a blue font color is text that staff has revised in a particular amendment since the first time the amendment was reviewed. This may include changes proposed by the PZC, or changes that staff has made in general.

Mr. Smith brought the text up on the projector screen for review. He said amendment #A17 is a new amendment that was added since the most recent work session. It addresses an issue regarding the size of cul-de-sacs, which has been a recent issue. He said Mr. Zenner would speak more on that amendment when they got to it.

Amendment #A12. There was discussion of the administrative plat requirements section of code in terms of clarifying what was meant by “less than 120 feet of street frontage” and also the resubdivision procedure code section in terms of how the section was structured. Admin plats do not go to City Council but are approved administratively. The applicability of admin plats was discussed versus the intent of the code. In general, admin plats should be a tool for moving lot lines. Admin plats are processed as a replat if the criteria for an Admin plat are not met which typically requires only Council approval. Commissioners generally thought the text was clearer in its application and use relating to when and how an admin plat would be appropriate.

Amendment #A13 (Monuments). Mr. Smith said Mr. Bauer was also in attendance to discuss this type of amendment. He said this amendment was intended to provide compliance with the minimum standard for property boundary surveys under current state law. No concern with the amendment was cited.

Amendment #A14 (Powers and Duties of the PZC Commission). Mr. Smith and Mr. Zenner described this amendment had been the request of the Human Rights Commission to remove the negative connotation of the term “slum clearance”, which is found within the Missouri State Statute Section 89.340 RSMo that this section is based upon. Staff recommend deleting the reference and additional text to be replaced with “development projects” and add the reference to the relevant state statute be included. The Commission discussed how this would also remove the reference from the PZC’s Commission webpage maintained on the Boards and Commissions website for the City. This amendment had general support.

Amendment #A15 (Optional development standards approval). This amendment provided a corrected reference to a table. This was a clean-up/housekeeping amendment.

Amendment #A16. This was a clean-up/housekeeping amendment to fix a reference to a variance which should have been referred to as a conditional use instead.

Amendment #A17. This amendment was proposed to address an internal conflict within the UDC Appendix A with the International Fire Code relating to cul-de-sac design standards.

The 2018 International Fire Code Appendix D was adopted by City Council and requires that turnarounds for terminal streets comply with one of the allowed designs. One of those designs is a cul-de-sac, which requires a minimum pavement diameter of 96 feet, while the current UDC only requires 76 feet. Since the IFC was adopted by Council and requires a wider pavement design than the UDC, the larger design is required unless otherwise authorized by the Fire Official and approved by the Public Works Director. The new text will reference the IFC, but also maintains the minimum width for both the pavement and right of way as defined within the UDC as the minimum allowable design standard.

The proposed text amendment affected four sections of code, the first three in the street type references and the fourth section in the terminal street section that describes cul-de-sacs themselves.

Mr. Zenner described alternatives they’d seen and some of the alternatives the code would permit subject to approval by the Fire Department. Mr. Zenner described how this amendment would impact projects currently in the pipeline as the issue had not been called out until recently. He said all projects with preliminary plat approval will be allowed to present final plats with the smaller cul-de-sac design, but all new preliminary plats and final plats would need to meet the new standard or obtain alternative design approval.

He said the code amendment was needed now to alert the design community to the new requirement and to address the conflict, but that there may be additional review and revisions later. The Fire Department, Community Development, and Public Works Department were going to continue looking at the requirement and the trade-offs. There may be maintenance, snow removal, and environmental negatives to consider in addition to the benefits of larger cul-de-sacs. They were looking at standards and subdivision built in other communities as well for more information.

Mr. Smith said that as they had finished review of all the new amendments and as such there was time to review some of the previously discussed amendments. He said there had been revisions included in the draft to reflect the Commission’s comments from previous work sessions.

The Commission and staff reviewed the text amendment regarding banks and lending intuitions. Staff looked at State language and language from other communities. There was discussion on the difference between a jewelry store and a pawn shop, and how the State differentiated between them. Staff noted that they had removed any reference to a specific dollar amount and instead referenced State Statute. This would allow for future distinction in the code if desired. It was noted that pawn shows would be allowed in more districts than just in the office if it was considered a retail/commercial use. If in the land use table, pawn shows would fall in the commercial zones. There was discussion by the Commission on the difference between a transfer of funds and a transfer of goods. It was conclude that the text as proposed was acceptable and that a pawn shop was more a retail/commercial use and should be coded as such in the Permitted Use Table.

The amendment describing and discussing clear cutting and logging were believed to be far clearer. The previous concern was that the removal would open up to more cutting when that wasn't the intent. The text has removed references to clear cutting, but has additional language now and logging was clarified with information about logging permits and tree preservation plans. Concerns had generally been fixed with the amended text.

There was discussion on signage. Staff intended to move forward with the proposed amendments, noting that there were some Commissioners that were still at odds with the amendment due to the line between commercial signage and wayfinding/murals not always being very clear. Staff noted that the Commissioners were welcome to bring up their concerns on the record during the public hearing. This may be an area to review more in the future; however, staff desired to clean-up the text now and was willing to do more research on the topic and potentially have more discussion in the second round of text changes.

Commissioners generally agreed the maximum parking sections of the code were clearer now with the revised amendments.

Mr. Zenner said staff anticipated on having the public hearing on the amendments at the second meeting in January with a procedure similar to how they had done past text amendments in which each amendment would have a separate vote so that the minutes could capture the specific issues and area of consensus for the Council to consider. This would be scheduling a public hearing for January 21.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

- Meeting adjourned approximately 6:58 pm

ACTION(S) TAKEN:

Motion made by Commissioner Burns, seconded by Commissioner MacMann, to approve the agenda as submitted. Made motion by Commissioner Burns, seconded by Commissioner Carroll, to approve the November 19, 2020 work session minutes as presented.