

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
JANUARY 21, 2021

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

**Ms. Sara Loe
Ms. Valerie Carroll
Ms. Lee Russell
Ms. Tootie Burns
Ms. Joy Rushing
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Mr. Brian Toohey
Ms. Sharon Geuea Jones**

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Mr. Michael MacMann

STAFF PRESENT

**Mr. Pat Zenner
Mr. Rusty Palmer
Mr. Clint Smith
Mr. Brad Kelley
Ms. Rebecca Thompson
Mr. Tim Teddy**

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. LOE: I would like to bring the January 21st, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

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

MS. CARROLL: We have eight present; 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: No, there are not, ma'am.

MS. RUSSELL: I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. I'll take a thumbs up approval on the agenda.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: Looks unanimous.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MS. LOE: Everyone should have received a copy of the January 7th, 2021 meeting minutes.

Were there any adjustments or edits to those minutes?

MS. RUSSELL: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. Moved by Ms. Russell. I'll take a thumbs up approval on the minutes.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: It looks unanimous. Thank you.

V. TABLING REQUEST

MS. LOE: Our first item of business today is a tabling request,

Case Number 29-2021

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of BC Investments of Columbia, LLC (owner), for approval of a preliminary plat to be known as "Waco North." The plat consists of 42.64 acres. The purpose of the preliminary plat is to designate the location of the Waco Road right-of-way which would permit development of the property to the south, which is part of the Tuscany Ridge development. (The applicant is requesting that this item be tabled to the February 4, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. This is the applicant's second tabling request.)

MS. LOE: Are there any staff comments on this?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, Ms. Chairman. This is an item that we had anticipated on bringing back before the Commission this evening for consideration. However, due to the holiday and our not receiving some documentation that we needed to have in order to review an associated development agreement that will be accompanying a final plat with this property, we have not yet been able to have an internal meeting. While this is the applicant's second tabling request, it is possible that there may be one additional one, and pursuant to the Planning Commission's rules, you are capable of approving an additional request. We're getting all of our information together at this point in order to have a more full discussion of the development agreement criteria, but we're not quite certain yet if, after we've had that discussion internally as a staff, we're going to be able to bring this back to you on the 4th. We did communicate with the applicant today. They asked us to leave it on for the 4th's agenda. That deadline production -- that packet production deadline is January 29th, which is next Friday. And if we do not have any issues with the development agreement discussion next week, we will likely produce the plat and bring the plat to you without having a fully completed development agreement for the applicant. They're aware of that and that's something that they felt comfortable with, but we're not certain what those

comments internally will be in relationship to it. So I just want to alert you that, while this is not a public hearing item, we will probably be redoing public notification on it because it will be extending beyond probably the two months from initial application, and we may have an additional tabling on it, but it is not necessarily at the fault of the applicant. It is more just from a coordination issue at the time of the year that this project came in.

MS. LOE: All right.

MR. ZENNER: With that, we are supportive of the tabling request to allow us to continue to take the necessary action to meet internally to discuss other related development issues here.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. So you mentioned this is not a public hearing item, and this was advertised as a tabling -- as an item to be tabled?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. When we produced the agenda for this meeting this evening, this tabling request was here, as was the previous request for the January -- for the December 10 meeting. So we are hoping that we can resolve these matters before the 4th's production deadline for this next packet. Otherwise, we'll have another request to table.

MS. LOE: All right. So any questions on tabling? Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: I guess I'm just wondering -- well, I mean, if they want it on the 4th, they want it on the 4th. It seems to me that it would be more prudent to push it to the 18th, so we don't have -- because, at some point, under our rules, don't they have to start all over if they table too many times?

MR. ZENNER: So on a public hearing item, there are typically two tablings that are allocated to the applicant themselves. Any additional tablings beyond that are at the discretion of the Commission and typically, we've had very few instances where a third tabling request is needed without a -- short of having a full resubmission of the application. I'll cover this a little bit later this evening, but we do not have business items for the second meeting in February. Therefore when discussing the matter with the applicant today, they had indicated they would like to try to resolve this prior to our production deadline for the 4th's meeting. However, if we can't, they are -- they understand that we will take it up at the March 4th meeting at that point. So they were in agreement to -- they wanted it on this agenda. I had recommended that it be tabled to the 4th of March. They said no, let's keep it where it is. We're confident we can get our -- our answers that we need by next week, and I'm hopeful that we'll be able to get those, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So as of right now, we don't have a February 18th?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. At least a regular meeting. We will have a work session, and I'll get to that under staff comments at the end of tonight's meeting.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? Ms. Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: In the -- I'm going to go ahead and make a motion, if that's okay. In the Case of 29-2021, I move to table this case to the February 4th, 2021 Planning and Zoning meeting.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: I'm going to give it to Ms. Rushing. Second by Ms. Rushing. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none. Ms. Carroll, can we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting yes is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: We have eight to approve. The motion to table carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for tabling is -- carries.

VI. SUBDIVISIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case Number 56-2021

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of The Housing Authority of the City of Columbia, Missouri, a Missouri Corporation (owner), for approval of a two-lot final plat on property zoned R-MF (Multi-Family Dwelling), to be known as Bryant Walkway Apartments II - North Plat 2. This request also includes a design adjustment from Section 29-5.1(f)(3) of the UDC to allow a new lot line through a structure (paved driveway). The 1.23-acre site is improved with five duplexes and one fourplex and is located on the west frontage of Trinity Place between Pendelton Street and Allen Street.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Brad Kelley of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends the following:

1. Approval of the design adjustment to Section 29-5.1(f)(3) (Lot Lines over Structures) relating to the platting of a property line through an existing driveway.
2. Approval of the proposed final plat, subject to minor technical corrections. Alternatively, if the Commission does not support the requested design adjustment, the plat should not be recommended for approval.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Before we move on to questions, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte related to this case to please share that with the Commission so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: When we get to the motion time, do you want two separate motions?

MR. KELLEY: Yes, ma'am.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? If there are none, we will open up the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If anyone has any comments they would like to share on this case, please come forward and give your name and address for the record.

MR. MURPHY: Good evening, Chair, Commissioners. My name is Kevin Murphy with A Civil Group. Our office is at 3401 on Broadway Business Park Court. The reason for this replat is the Housing Authority has plans to redevelop this site in a similar format where, again, we can -- the nonconformities, we can adjust around those so they would not -- and the redevelopment would not be there. The upcoming item that we have, the PD plan for Kinney Point at Sexton and Garth would be a replacement housing project that would be built prior to these being torn down and it being rebuilt there. The reason for the replat to separate that lot out of Lot 2 to the south is just a funding mechanism with their RAD funding scheme. If you have more questions about, I have Phil Steinhaus, CEO of the Housing Authority, here, could explain that. But basically is they're getting funding for this -- these specific buildings and -- and that needs to be separated from the -- from the other ones that they are not going to replace at this time. Just a -- anyways, again, Phil could answer that better than I can. But other than that, again, the buildings will be rearranged so the nonconformities -- when it's redeveloped, the nonconformities will no longer exist.

MS. LOE: Any questions for Mr. Murphy? So is the proposed unit count going to stay the same?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS. LOE: And the changes are being purely driven by funding?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional comments on this case? If there are none, we'll close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: Well, since there's no discussion, I'm going to move that in Case 56-2021 to approve the design adjustment to Section 29-5.1(f)(3), lot lines over structure, relating to the platting of the property line through an existing driveway.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

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

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

MS. CARROLL: I have eight to approve; motion carries.

MS. LOE: Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: Second motion. In Case 56-2021, I move to approve the final plat, Bryant Walkway Apartments II - North Plat 2, subject to the minor technical corrections.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this

motion? Seeing none. Ms. Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

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

MS. CARROLL: We have eight to approve; the motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for the design adjustment and final plat will be forward to City Council.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

MS. LOE: That brings us to Case 46-2021. Any Commissioner recusals on this case?

MS. CARROLL: I will recuse myself from this case.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Carroll. Anyone else? Seeing none.

Case Number 46-2021

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of the Columbia Housing Authority (owners), for approval of a major amendment to the Kinney Point PD Plan, and the associated statement of intent, on property at the northeast corner of Sexton Road and Garth Avenue. The proposed plan includes 24 multi-family units in a mix of two, three, and four bedrooms. The site is 1.96 acres in size, which results in a total density of 12.23 units per acre.

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 PD Plan to be known as Kinney Point PD Plan, pursuant to minor technical corrections.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Before we move on to staff questions, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte related to this case to please share that with the Commission now so all Commissioners have benefit from the same information in front of us. Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. I just wanted to let the Commission know that the -- one of the people anyway whose comments were left off the original agenda that was sent out did contact me and I assured her that her comments had been received, but she did not provide me with any information that was not in the comments that were sent with the revised agenda. But I just want to be upfront. She reached out and I was, like, they're there, don't worry about it.

MS. LOE: We appreciate it. Thank you. Any additional comments? If not, are there any questions for staff? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: That was an excellent staff report. Thank you, Mr. Palmer. I have questions about the alley. To the north, it looks like -- is there an alley, it's to the north of Fourth Street also?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. I don't know if it's in existence, or if it's just in the form of right-of-way, but

--

MS. BURNS: I can't tell from the aerial what -- so is the alley that's being proposed on this project -- why? Why an alley?

MR. PALMER: It's not proposed, it's in existence.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MR. PALMER: And in the form of right-of-way again. It's not constructed. There's actually a home in -- that crosses into it on the east end of the block, which is probably why it's never been constructed, but it's -- it was platted and it's there. If the City every chose to open it, they could, but, at this point, there's -- there's really no use for it, as far as I know, and hence the agreement to, if and when we decide we want that, we'll ask for that extra foot and a half of right-of-way.

MS. BURNS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional? Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: I just want to clarify this, and this may be part of me still learning the ropes. But there is already an approved PD plan in place they could build today; is that correct?

MR. PALMER: That is somewhat correct. So the plan is old enough that it would be outdated, but the statement of intent that lays out the setbacks and the uses and, basically, outlines what's on the plan is still in effect. And so they would have to get a new plan approved, but they would, basically, be asking for the same thing that's been previously approved.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And that -- that includes, like, apartment, multi-family, as opposed to this?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. It's just a monolithic multi-family building.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I just wanted to clarify that. I thought that was right. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? Mr. Palmer, I had a question. On the plan we received as part of the report, under density, it lists the total lot area as 1.96 acres, and then it says proposed number of units is 16. Did we receive a draft copy of the plan or is this another minor technical correction that needs to be made on the plan?

MR. PALMER: It may actually be another correction. I didn't catch that.

MS. LOE: All right. Just wanted to point that out.

MR. PALMER: But I'll look at it. I'll take a look at it.

MS. LOE: Then I had a question about the parking. So the plan or the report notes that -- well, I'm going to back to the plan. The plan identifies the required parking is based on 2.5 spaces per unit for the three- and four-bedroom units, and two spaces per unit for the two-bedroom units. This appears to be based on the multi-family parking requirements.

MR. PALMER: That -- yeah. That is correct.

MS. LOE: For a total of 56 spaces. What I don't see in that calculation is the additional requirement for visitor parking, which is one space for every five units. So with 24 units, that would be another five parking spaces. So the total required parking based on multi-family would actually be 61 spaces?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. I think the multi-family is shown for informational purposes, and this is technically single-family attached, which is the -- the --

MS. LOE: We're getting there.

MR. PALMER: Okay.

MS. LOE: Okay. But you agree that multi-family does have a requirement for guest parking for every five units?

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MS. LOE: All right. So 61 spaces required under the multi-family. So single-family attached, under 29-3.3(b) in the R-2 standard allows a maximum of two attached units. If you're going to go more than two attached units, multi-family allows up to six attached units.

MR. PALMER: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: So the proposed development exceeds R-2 and actually appears -- actually exceeds our standard for multi-family.

MR. PALMER: You mean in terms of the units that are connected?

MS. LOE: The number of units are attached together or the single-family attached.

MR. PALMER: Well, as the PD plan -- yeah. Yeah. As a PD plan, they can ask for that.

MS. LOE: I understand they're coming in under PD, but my point is we appear to be applying -- in the report, you're applying the R-2 parking standards, but we're applying the -- it's meeting the multi-family attached housing standard. We're looking -- we're using different standards here.

MR. PALMER: And you can do that under a planned district. That's --

MS. LOE: I need a different justification about why we should be reducing the parking than saying it meets the R-2, because the reason, in my mind, that R-2 is allowed less parking is because you do have a fewer density of units, so there's more driveway and more curb space applied. Based on not quite two units or two parking spaces per unit, and we have ten four-bedroom units, which under Columbia Housing Authority allows eight occupants per unit -- per dwelling unit, we have no visitor parking, and I'm concerned we don't have adequate parking for the proposed type of units that we have in this development. So is there another justification, other than its attached housing standard for R-2 because that doesn't make sense to me?

MR. PALMER: I mean, they're single-family homes, technically, under a PD, and so --

MS. LOE: I understand, but it meets the multi-family definition, which then, following logic, should meet the multi-family requirement for parking.

MR. PALMER: I mean, again, this is -- I don't know.

MR. ZENNER: Ms. Loe, the project was reviewed by our staff as an attached single-family housing development.

MS. LOE: I understand.

MR. ZENNER: And as attached single-family housing, we apply the two parking spaces per

dwelling unit. That is our standard internal practice. We do not apply multi-family standards to an attached single-family project. And so the disconnect between what is shown on the plan for contextual purposes and what is stated within the statement of intent indicating that there are two parking spaces per dwelling unit generally, is consistent with our standards that we would apply in this particular instance. The fact that there are more units in a single building --

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. ZENNER: -- group than what is otherwise allowed, while not pointed out in the staff report, would be considered a design exception from what the standard rule is for the total number of attached units permissible. Now that is an oversight on our part, for which I will apologize. However, the parking here is what the Housing Authority can address based on its historical parking usage, even though the units do contain more than what would maybe be in your mind an appropriate number of individuals to occupy them. And I -- the applicant is here to address the concern that you may have with parking, but our staff has analyzed this as a single-family attached product, and we apply two parking spaces per dwelling unit.

MS. LOE: I'm sorry if you misunderstood me, Mr. Zenner. I wasn't saying I disagreed with eight occupants in a four-bedroom unit. I'm questioning that eight occupants will only use not quite two parking stalls.

MR. ZENNER: If the occupants --

MS. LOE: I also had a comment about the outdoor space, if we can move on from parking. The previous PUD had a gazebo, which I believe would be appropriate for a one-bedroom complex that would be primarily geared toward senior or adults. This is a family complex, and I noticed in the statement of intent that a playground or a picnic area may be included. I believe that should be included at this time due to the fact that, per neighbors' comments, and I agree there are not nearby play spaces, so that is something I would like to hear a little bit more about. The other question I had was the staff report indicated that the units on Sexton are facing Sexton. It appears to me that half the units on Sexton may be facing Sexton, but the other half of the units are actually backed up on Sexton. So -- well, then they're drawn inconsistently?

MR. PALMER: Why would you think they're backing up on it, specifically?

MS. LOE: Because the front porch patio and the back patio are indicated differently in the plan, and if you look at the west fourplex and the east sixplex, you can see that the west fourplex has what's shown as the front patio on the north or is facing Sexton, but it is shown on the north side facing the internal green on the east side of the street. So I would like -- I just would like it clarified whether or not the homes are facing the street or not.

MR. PALMER: I think the engineer on the case might be able to expand on that. From the plan, it could just be a difference in design per unit or something, but --

MS. LOE: That -- that would be great. Any additional questions? Seeing none, we'll open the

floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If you can give your name and address for the public record. We are going to limit speakers to three minutes. If you're speaking for a group, we'll allow you six minutes.

MR. STEINHAUS: Six minutes?

MS. LOE: If you're speaking for a group.

MR. STEINHAUS: Phil Steinhaus, CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority, with offices at 201 Switzler Street. Now, if I can answer all your questions in six minutes. A little history on this project. The Housing Authority launched an affordable housing initiative in 2012. Based on my leadership there, I believe the Housing Authority should be a leader in affordable housing in our community. It hasn't always been that way. I think we've done an excellent job since then in launching our affordable housing initiative. We acquired this piece of property when Grace Covenant Church was way under water on their mortgage, and so we basically helped buy them out so that they didn't end up going bankrupt over this. Our original plan was to build a three-story building that had 42 units. It said 40, but it's actually 42 units; 36 one-bedroom, six two-bedroom units, and it was going to be new affordable housing built with low-income housing tax credits. It did not get funding from the Missouri Housing Development Commission. In the next year, the Housing Authority got approved for the Rental Assistance Housing Demonstration Program, or the RAD program through HUD. What RAD does, and we're the first Housing Authority in Missouri to be approved for RAD, it allows us to convert our fluctuating operating subsidies from HUD into long-term project-based housing voucher contracts. And so, basically, we have an approved rent structure for 20 years that allows us to be competitive for low-income housing tax credits. So in that time, we said, hey, we've got 717 units that are aging units of public housing property. We need to do something and that's why we applied for and got the RAD program. And so since then, we have renovated 597 public housing units in Columbia, and estimated about \$75 million to complete all those projects. This -- we have 120 units of public housing left. We applied for funding two years ago to renovate the Providence Walkway Apartments, which are directly across from Douglass High School. The Missouri Housing Development Commission said our project was too large and we needed to rework the project, and they said that the renovation, what it cost, was too close to new, so they wanted us to do new housing instead of renovations. So we reworked the project down to 36 units to be replaced on that site and still it did not get funded, and they said our credit request was too high. So what we looked at was some of the issues that -- that raised the cost of the project were the relocation issues with people as we were going to have to tear down units and then relocate people until we could the new units there. So the new plan allowed us to take this piece of property that we owned at Garth and Sexton and build new units there, and then move residents -- current residences from Providence Walkway and Trinity over into the 24 new units that were being built there. When we got everybody off Trinity, we could go in and tear down those units on Trinity and build new units there. And so that's really the emphasis of this whole project. I know there are people

that are concerned that this is green space here. This was never meant to be a park. We left this trail there because it was there. There wasn't any point in us going and tearing it up until we needed to redevelop the property. It was slated to be a church to begin with and approved for that as part of the Grace Covenant Community Development Corporation, again approved for a 42-unit, three-story building back in 2013, and now we're looking to redo that. Instead of doing that three-story building, we're looking at building family units, because the people that are on Trinity and Providence will be moved over into these sites and then that allows us to empty out units on Providence Walkway, which we can then tear down, move people off of Park Avenue into new units that we build on -- in the Providence Walkway area, and subsequently move our way all the way down Park Avenue until we have replaced all 120 units of public housing. So it's kind of stepping-stone kind of thing, so that's why we need vacant land to build new, move people there, tear down these units, build new units, move people from there to there. Does that make sense to everybody what the plan is? So a couple of things to keep in mind. To build affordable housing, you need affordable land. We were able to acquire this property. You know, we can find affordable land six miles out of town. That doesn't do our low-income people any good. So when we found this nice piece of property that was located close to our other properties, close to our warehouse where our ability to take care of this property and manage it better, it's a win-win for low-income people in our community to come in and redevelop this site. And so we're always looking for opportunities like that in the community. If we can find enough land to make a deal work, building a three- or four-, a six- or even ten-unit project is so expensive to do because there's still all the same amount of paperwork to do for a ten-unit project as there is to do for a 36-unit project, and the financing is very complicated. So with regards to the parking issue, a lot of our people that live in Providence Walkway and Trinity, they don't have cars, or they have one car per family. And so really this way more parking than is actually needed for this project. And if you want to drive through the neighborhood tonight when you leave, drive through and see that the parking lots are mostly empty. You've got -- they're not full right now, and we're way under the requirement per the number of units for the parking spaces that we have now. So green space, we tried to get as much green space as possible in this project, but, you know, we had to work on that parking issue. You put more parking in there, then it's just houses and concrete, and we don't want that for our families. The reason why we don't have a playground in there and a gazebo and the other types of things there is because it just increases the cost of our project. And so the more expensive the project is, the less likely we're going to get low-income housing tax credits to fund it. So our -- certainly our plan would be to come back and add those amenities later, but not have them included in the original plan. So we would come back, which we've successfully done a number of times, apply for Community Development Block Grant Funds, so we put in -- we just rebuilt the playground next to the Blind Boone Center with funds from the Community Development Block Grant Funds. We've done that multiple times on our properties, good partnerships with the City to do that, or find other sponsors for those types of things, but it's very, very competitive for low-income housing tax credits. And so if you guys want to see

affordable housing preserved in our central city, then this is the type of project that has to be done. Happy to answer any questions you might have.

MS. LOE: Any questions? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I want to repeat Commissioner Loe's comments about having a playground. This is multi-family -- well, families, housing for families on two relatively major streets. And I'm assuming those families are going to have children, and I'm assuming we don't want the children playing in the street, so I think some form of playground is really needed in this area. Also, I live in this not immediate area, but I am on Garth and Sexton on a regular basis. And I see tenants of Oak Towers, as you said, using that green space as a park. So my question is, are -- is there going to be some green space developed for the tenants of Oak Park to make up for the loss of this place where they currently go and sit and talk -- of course, not now, but in the past, it's just been kind of an area for people to go and sit and have some green space.

MR. STEINHAUS: Can you bring up the site -- the aerial view of that site?

MS. RUSHING: And I notice this area right here --

MR. STEINHAUS: And I'll pass out a couple of these while I'm trying to answer your questions.

MS. RUSHING: Like, this area --

MR. STEINHAUS: So catty-corner there, see all that green space right there, owned by the City of Columbia. We actually owned that property. When we were originally looking at doing some affordable housing development there, we had --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- (inaudible.)

MR. STEINHAUS: -- catty-corner, right across from Oak Towers, right there at the corner of Sexton and Garth on the southwest corner. See all the green space there? That's owned by the City of Columbia. We sold them those lots. We were going to develop housing there. The reason we stopped is because when the RAD program came along, we needed to focus our efforts on preserving the existing affordable housing public housing units that we own. That -- that site now has -- there's a big storm-water tunnel that runs through that site. And if you look at it, what they've done is they've opened up the storm-water tunnel in order to do more storm-water management on that property, but it's a perfect site for a walking trail, for a playground, for parks, for benches, all sorts of things for that whole community to enjoy. If you look on the -- on the southeast corner there next to Oak Towers, you can see kind of where the -- it looks like the grass is dead there. The grass isn't dead there. The grass is -- the reason why it looks there is that we installed 6,500-foot geothermal wells on that site when we renovated Oak Towers and converted it over to a ground source heat pump system for that building. Saved about \$100,000 a year in utility costs for that building, but that's also green space that the residents of Oak Towers can use. If you look kind of on the corner there, you'll see a bright green kind of square or triangle. That's a gazebo we built on the porch on the back patio of Oak Towers. Right next to that and surrounding that are all raised garden beds that our residents use for flowers, vegetables, et cetera. So those are certainly green space

for our residents and opportunities to do healthy things outside is very important to us. We would love to have a lot more amenities, but the more amenities you add to the initial project means the more expensive it is, and that translates into an increased cost per unit, which is what the Missouri Housing Development Commission looks at. And so when our price gets too high for the money that we ask for, then it doesn't get funded and it doesn't happen. So this was our third try at making this work, and we had to sharpen our pencil as much as we can because the last time they said you're asking for too much money. So if the community really needs green space, the City is sitting on a nice piece there. The City has a parks tax. The City could build a nice park there if they wanted to. It's not up to me to build a park.

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

MR. STANTON: I fully support this project.

MR. STEINHAUS: What's that?

MR. STANTON: I fully support this project.

MR. STEINHAUS: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: I wish there was a way I could hold your feet to the fire with the playground. I understand the price, so —

MR. STEINHAUS: I can tell you, we'll put in the playground if we can get this project funded. As soon as it gets built, then we'll apply for CDBG funds to come in and put in a playground. Or if we can afford to do it out of operational funds, then we will do that.

MR. STANTON: I like to hear that. That's wonderful.

MR. STEINHAUS: Yeah. We're not going to -- we've tried to put playgrounds all over our properties, so —

MR. STANTON: Because you're -- I mean, now that you've solidified the fact that these would be Trinity, and I live right across the street from all this stuff, so, yeah --

MR. STEINHAUS: We want that space to be used as part of community space, a gazebo, all sorts of things there. And if you look at the property -- if you can go back to the layout. There was a question about the porches. When we looked at the design, most people are going to park in the back. Right? They're coming in, they're bringing in their groceries, et cetera. They're going to come in -- the units that are on the north, they're going to use that as their front door. However, they're going to have a patio on the front and the back. And so, if they want to sit out on the patio facing the green space, they can. The people who have units that are facing Sexton, they're going to pull in -- and you can see there's a little pull-in space on the drive there where they can pull their car in, walk their groceries to their home. But most of those folks are going to spend their time looking out on the green space and not necessarily looking out on Sexton Road, but they have the opportunity to do both. So then we start getting into storm-water issues. And the more concrete we have here, the more City wants us to build all sorts of storm-water retention and add all sorts of extra costs to the projects. So if you want affordable housing for low-income people and this family in this community, then we've got to work together to figure out ways to

keep the cost of development down and not continue to add all these things that add to the cost of the property. So I think we've come up with the best design we could. It gives the maximum amount of green space, tries to redevelop aging -- over 50-years-old public housing that is poorly insulated, has aging plumbing systems. Electrical systems are not up to code. All sorts of issues with our properties. I know Mr. Stanton is well aware of those. And so that's what we're trying to do is preserve affording housing here in our community, and this is our next step in doing that.

MS. LOE: Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: So with the park or playground, in the meantime, are you -- or would the residents be able -- is there a playground that could be accessed from the school that's half a block away?

MR. STEINHAUS: No. They've got it marked off. They've got it all blocked off. You can't get to that -- the playground at Ridgeway Elementary. It's gated off, so you -- in non-school hours, it's not open. It's not open to the public.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you.

MR. STEINHAUS: There is a park just two blocks up, right there by the --

MR. ZENNER: Optimist?

MR. STEINHAUS: -- Optimist Club.

MS. LOE: Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: So I guess my question is, are we going to have the same problem here in 15 years that we do at the Providence Walkway and the Trinity Place units where they were put up inexpensively, and therefore, ran down quicker than you would normally see in a home built not through the housing department?

MR. STEINHAUS: Well, I'd be happy to put up inexpensive homes, and I could do it a lot cheaper than what this plan is, because when you go for low-income housing tax credits, they have all sorts of regulations where you have to build quality homes that's energy efficient. You have to use green building designs, and it has to be built so that it's going to last a long time. It's got a 30-year affordable housing compliance with it, so we have to keep the rents at a certain rate. In addition, these units, because we're replacing public housing units with them, we're able to offer that low-income subsidy through a project-based voucher, so everybody that would live there will have a subsidy and pay rent only based on what their income is. So a normal low-income housing tax credit property will have rents that are below market rate, but there are fixed rates. So if you go out to any of Jeff Smith's projects, Bethel Ridge, Sinclair Estates, Northampton Hanover, Lakewood Apartment, Columbia Square, they've all got a below market rate, but it's a fixed rate. And so if it would normally rent for \$600, it rents for \$400. But if you can't afford \$400, you can't live there. With a project-based voucher, if you can only afford \$100, that's all you pay, and the voucher pays the balance. So we're really serving the poorest of the poor with this project, and this serves people that are at or below mostly 30 percent of the adjusted household income. Now the average income of our residents is around \$10,000 a year.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I understand all that, and I generally --

MR. STEINHAUS: Well, you were implying that this was going to be cheap housing that was going to fall apart in 15 years. Right?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. That's what I'm concerned about. I don't -- I understand what you're doing, and I support what you're doing. I want to make sure that those people are living in quality housing, and not in sheds that are going to fall down, despite the fact that they can only afford \$150 a month.

MR. STEINHAUS: So where would you come up with the opinion that they're going to be sheds?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Based on the reports that I have heard about the condition of homes that have been built in the past by the Housing Authority.

MR. STEINHAUS: Which homes are that, please?

MS. GEUEA JONES: The Trinity Place and the -- the ones that you're getting ready to tear down because they're not in quality condition.

MR. STEINHAUS: The ones that were built 60 years ago during urban renewal?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. I live in a house that was built 80 years ago and is in good condition. That's my point.

MR. STEINHAUS: Okay. I can't do anything about what was built 60 years ago except go in and replace it. Have you seen our Bryant Walkway Apartments, our Bryant Walkway --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm making sure that what you're doing here is with the intention that they are of high quality.

MR. STEINHAUS: I'm asking you if you've seen what we have done, the 717 or the 597 units that we've completed in the last five years. Have you looked at any of those?

MS. GEUEA JONES: I haven't had an opportunity to tour them. I'm not trying to attack you, sir.

MR. STEINHAUS: Well, they're very well built.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I am trying to get an assurance from you on the record. I am not trying to attack you.

MR. STEINHAUS: Well --

MR. ZENNER: Phil, can you respond --

MR. STEINHAUS: It felt -- it felt like you said we were building shacks that wouldn't last more than 15 years. That's what it sounded like to me, so --

MR. ZENNER: Phil, is the Housing Authority required to comply with the City of Columbia's codes as it relates to energy efficiency and meeting our construction standards?

MR. STEINHAUS: Absolutely. Our units are actually a lot more efficient -- energy efficient than the City requires. And the reason for that is the affordable housing equation is rent plus utilities. And if you can only afford a hundred bucks rent, you can't afford \$200 in utilities. If you talk to the people up on Stewart Parker on Lincoln and Unity where we rebuilt all those units, the residents will tell you that their utility bills have been cut in half. It makes the housing more affordable.

MS. LOE: Well, MHDC requires energy star compliance, I believe.

MR. STEINHAUS: Right. Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: Yeah.

MR. STEINHAUS: And they require very strict reviews by their architects.

MS. LOE: Well, they do -- they do construction inspection, in addition to the City's?

MR. STEINHAUS: They do.

MS. LOE: And they're good. We -- I do a lot of MHDC renovations on 50-plus year-old multi-family properties.

MR. STEINHAUS: Pardon me?

MS. LOE: Our properties are more than 50 years old.

MR. STEINHAUS: Yeah.

MS. LOE: But we do renovations.

MR. STEINHAUS: Right. Well, these -- when these units were built 50, 60 years ago, they were not being built to the market for people to buy a house. These were built because people in Columbia didn't want to look at the poor housing conditions that existed down along Providence Road because that's where Flat Branch Creek ran. And you know where the Flat Branch Park is and the tunnel there, part of urban renewal came in and undergrounded all of Flat Branch Creek through there. Otherwise, it was a big muddy mess, and that's where all the poor people lived, and people got tired of looking at people looking [sic] in shacks. And so they built the cheapest and most cost-effective housing for people at that time, and it meant no insulation. They have cast-iron sewer pipes. You don't do that anymore. These are things that the Housing Authority has been working to address, and I would be more than happy to take you on a guided tour of our properties and show you what we've done. I think you would be very impressed.

MS. LOE: Any more questions? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm going to revise that story. It wasn't that Columbia didn't like what they were looking at, it was they took advantage of the African American community.

MR. STEINHAUS: Yeah. Okay. I'll agree with that.

MR. STANTON: And they used that opportunity to make public housing, which, at that point, was -- had a lot lax -- a lot more lax regulations. I think Mr. Phil has done a great job in putting this plan together, and don't take offense because we've still got to vote.

MR. STEINHAUS: Yeah, I don't -- yeah. And we'll keep coming back.

MR. STANTON: Still got to vote. So I wanted to change that story. So -- and those -- and the ones that he's replacing are not -- I mean, they've held up in -- they're pretty bad conditions. I mean, they're just cinder block, and they're -- you know, if there was to be a flood, those are probably the ones that are -- that are last, but --

MR. STEINHAUS: But we've taken good care of them, but the maintenance costs continue to go up.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. So that's just -- that's just time and --

MR. STEINHAUS: We're not just letting them run down.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. That's just time and -- you know, and the conditions that they were built in, and the political climate at the time. So, yeah. I just want to make sure that -- that story is a little revised, but I plan to support this, and I know they're going to be quality, because if they're not, we won't give you no more approval.

MR. STEINHAUS: Well, I -- you know, sorry if I got a little tense or I got my -- the hair up on my neck a little bit over that, but, you know, frankly, I feel like -- that the City ought to be bending over backwards to support what the Columbia Housing Authority is doing. And sometimes when I come before, and people talk about the need for affordable housing in the community and then it seems like there are a lot of barriers put up for us to try to get our work done.

MS. LOE: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: Well, and I -- I do want to say that visually the new buildings that you have put in are very attractive.

MR. STEINHAUS: Thank you.

MS. RUSHING: I think you're doing what you can to improve the overall environment. I'm just very much into putting in a little bit of green space when we can because, you know, we have Worley Street Park, which is probably a single long lot or maybe two back-to-back lots, but it's worth a lot to have that little space. But I think your point was well taken. Maybe some of us can get some not-for-profits to pony up and put in a playground.

MR. STEINHAUS: Well, they're not going to develop that lot right on the other corner, the opposite corner, the southwest corner. The City owns it, so you don't have to acquire the land. All you've got to do is put in the playground equipment. You could probably do that for \$50,000. The parks has a parks tax. You could put a trail, you could put a playground, you could plant a lot of trees in that area. For me, I can't figure out why the City couldn't take that land and do a bunch of stuff there, and then not have to build -- put in a whole bunch of trees and shrubby plants and everything else that we're required to do.

MS. RUSHING: They want, evidently, to put houses; isn't that what you indicated?

MR. STEINHAUS: Pardon me?

MS. RUSHING: Didn't you indicate that the City's plan for that was affordable housing?

MR. STEINHAUS: No. No. Uh-uh. We sold -- we owned almost all of that block there. We sold those to the City when we got approved for the Rental Assistance Demonstration Program. The City has developed the Lynn Street Cottages on the lots that we owned up there on Lynn Street, but they decided that trying to develop additional houses down on Sexton from the intersection there at Garth and Sexton up is that it would be better for storm-water mitigation because of that giant storm-water tunnel that runs through there, so they opened it up, and so that whole area is there to slow down the flow of storm water should we get a huge rain. But that doesn't mean that it couldn't be for a park. The kids are not going to

play -- play in the playground, I guess, if it's a foot -- under a foot of water, but that water will recede, and it could be developed. And if the City wants to give us money to build a playground there, we would be happy to do that.

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

MR. STEINHAUS: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers?

MS. JESSE: My name Connie Jesse; I live at 16 East Sexton Road. And the earliest date on this presentation has been 2012. I've owned my house since 1983. So when we first -- my sister and I first bought our house, there were seven privately owned houses in this property that's being discussed now. In July of 1997, Dorothy Martin, who lived at 14 East Sexton Road, was murdered by someone that was inappropriately living at 17 East Sexton Road. So now, moving forward, it's a -- it's a very nice green space. City of Refuge has been a very good neighbor to us. My concerns -- when we first brought -- when we first moved into our house, probably the second time that it rained, the intersection of Sexton and Garth, you could get in a boat and ride around. I don't know how long Ms. Rushing, she said she's lived in that area, but the sewer system has not -- well, it's not that great. They have done some improvements, but I don't think they've done enough to support this housing property. My second issue is is Mr. Steinhaus was talking about that the green space here and just referring to it for Oak Towers. But the reality of the situation, the community as a whole uses that green space. The track, people walk their dogs, people ride bikes, kids ride bikes in that area because you don't have to worry about traffic because there is a trail that goes around that area. And the proposal that I've seen tonight and listened to, it just -- they look like sardine apartments. It looks like you're just going to try to pack as many people in there as you can. And the traffic is already not great on Sexton and Garth, and you're proposing much more traffic. The sight lines, the property goes of the way that it's shown in the diagram, I mean, there's going to be a lot of accidents there, especially if you do -- put a roundabout. And my other concern is is that the Housing Authority is also -- they have oversight over Oak Towers, and Oak Towers has some serious problems. If you talk to residents in that Housing Authority, several of them are moving out. There's four people that I know of recently are moving out because of the vandalism in their cars and their apartments have been broken into. And I -- I don't see the Housing Authority maintaining a self -- a safe environment with Oak Towers, and now you're going to go across to Sexton and Garth on the north side and put more housing in there. And I don't think it's good for the community. Thank you.

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

MR. STANTON: Phil Steinhaus. You have this land at your --

MS. LOE: Speak into the microphone.

MR. STANTON: You own this land. You're Phil. You own this land. It's on your books, you pay taxes, all this good stuff. What would you -- what would be the alternative? What could be a win-win in your eyes for this property?

MS. JESSE: Not putting what you're proposing on there. There has to -- someone was talking about Ridgeway School and green space and places for kids to play. There are a lot of kids that -- in the -- that come in the community. If you're -- I understand that there's a need for public housing, but that spot cannot hold what's being proposed.

MR. STANTON: Are you saying less density? Are you saying what?

MS. JESSE: It needs to be much less, and you also need -- you can't build it all the way up to Sexton and Garth because, even if you put a roundabout in there, traffic is still not going to be able -- it's -- it's going to -- you have Ridgeway School. There's school buses that go there. It used to be that the bus line, when we first moved in there, the bus line was -- it went down Garth and it went down Sexton. But he's talking about that a lot of them don't have cars, so what? Are they are going to change the bus line to where they're going to put buses through there? It's not going to work. I don't think this is -- you're -- I understand the need for -- for public housing, but the number of units that you're talking about putting on this, it -- the community can't support it. And I would -- I mean, I'm sorry that he doesn't like that it's a green space and it never was supposed to be a green space, but it's a great green space, and it needs -- what you're proposing needs to be reduced significantly for the community to be able to sustain what's being put on the table.

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

MS. JESSE: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case?

MR. MURPHY: Good evening, Chair and Commissioners. Kevin Murphy with A Civil Group again, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. To address some of her concerns, first of all, density. The existing plan that we have now accounts for 42 units, 2013. It's a three-story building. It's much, much more dense than what's here. Traffic concerns were addressed then. It's the City's idea to potentially put a round-about at that intersection. It's not -- it's not our idea, but we gave room for that. We've limited access onto Garth in case that does happen, again trying to address all the traffic issues that we're thinking of in the future. Not only us, but the City's traffic engineers, as well. Again, I understand that this is a piece of private property. The City -- or the Housing Authority has allowed people to use it, but should they put up no-trespassing signs, these people are trespassing. It's a private piece of property that they've allowed people to use, but, once again, to allow for affording housing in an urban area where typically you have more density, this is what needs to happen. And we've decreased that density than what they're allowed to do right now. Again, the City owns property catty-corner from here, public property that could be developed into a parkland, and that -- that's where we stand on that. As far as the storm water is concerned, we're having to meet all the City's storm-water requirements, provide retention and water quality treatment, as well, with this project, so it will have no more runoff than as it sits now.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- but there's still -- (inaudible.)

MR. MURPHY: Yes. There's still runoff, but we -- we detain it, so it does not increase the amount

of flow that as it is now, and which is basically undeveloped property. As far as the vandalism in Oak Towers, Oak Towers -- I mean, the Housing Authority is not a police force. That's -- that's a police enforcement issue, whether it's happening there or in any other apartment complex or in any other neighborhood, that's a police issue.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you -- (inaudible.)

MS. LOE: Ms. Jesse, I'm sorry. If you're not at the microphone, we can't capture your comments for the record.

MR. MURPHY: Yeah. Again, I would -- I would say that, just as any other privately owned housing complex or even an owner of a house that rents it out, those are issues that you try to deal with, but they're enforced by the police, not necessarily the owner. Again, you pointed out the density on the -- the plan was incorrect with the 16 units. There's 24 units, but on the 1.96, it's the still the same number of 12.25 units per acre. Trying to get through this all in a hurry in my three minutes here. Yes. All the units on -- do face Sexton will be fronts and look like fronts. Again, they have porches on the back to enjoy whatever green space we have, and they can access from the pull-off spot and whatnot. The parking, again, we're trying to decrease impervious area and runoff, and the Housing Authority issues permits for parking, so they know what -- what they deal with and what their parking needs are. Other than that, I would be happy any more questions. Running out of breath.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Murphy. Actually, the comment on parking permits, I think, for me anyway, is the most informational. I -- I work in affordable housing, albeit not in Columbia, outside of Columbia. But I can tell you that one thing I am looking at on a regular basis is adding parking to our multi-family properties. So I do not equate affordable housing with not needing parking. I'm sorry. Not a reality in the affordable housing world I work in. So a much stronger argument for me is not mixing and matching zoning regulations, which is what I do see the report as having done, but if there is evidence -- documented evidence that there is a reduced need for housing at this specific project, let's include that. I do not want to set a precedent for using -- for going below a standard that we then need to justify or demonstrate later. So, thank you, Mr. Murphy, for that.

MR. MURPHY: I would also like to add that, if I could, Oak Towers across the way, again, the parking lot that they own is underutilized and we recognize that that could be --

MS. LOE: Understood. But Sexton, you can only park on one side of the street. Garth, I'm not sure if you can really park on either side. And they're both snow emergency streets, so during winter, lack of parking. Yeah. So I was looking at the parking --

MR. MURPHY: I'm just saying we have additional parking opportunities at Oak Towers.

MS. LOE: Yeah. Speaking of which, bicycle spaces. It was in the earlier PUD Plan. It is mentioned in this PUD plan, but I don't see it on the plan. Do we need it shown on the plan in order for it to actually be included or is it enough for it to be listed?

MR. ZENNER: It's required.

MS. LOE: Does it need to be shown?

MR. ZENNER: It would probably be best that it is shown, but if it is not, it's still going to be a requirement since the parking lot has more than 25 parking spaces.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you. That's an omission on my part because I would normally include that.

MS. LOE: All right. It would be nice if it wasn't an afterthought, too. Any questions for Mr. Murphy? I see none. Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional comments on this project? Seeing none, we'll close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As my colleagues know, I'm well versed in this area of affordable housing and the -- the fight and the balance that's necessary to make it happen. I plan to support this just because it's -- it's necessary. I do hear the neighbors and maybe less density probably would have been a good thing. I understand where Phil is trying to go, since I heard the bigger picture. He's moving people from Trinity into this and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. I will say this because I'm a neighbor. He is correct that I live across the street from Trinity, and most of those families are international families, so they either share rides or they just don't have rides. It's a beautiful neighborhood because it's just like a -- I don't know -- United Nations. So those people moving to this area will probably be a good thing once they're built. And I'm just going to say this, and I've said I supported it. The Housing Authority does have a stigma. It's up to Phil to change that, and his projects have to be his resume. And you have to just continue to produce good work and, you know, that -- Mr. Phil can't really change that, he can only show his work and, you know, that will change how -- how people look at the Housing Authority. And it's the history, you know, I'll go back, history lesson. His organization was birthed from the urban renewal, and it had a direct -- and, you know, positive, in some ways, but a lot more negative than positive in the other way, so he's fighting an historic, you know, stigma about his organization. So just kind of help -- help Phil out a little bit, but he still has a responsibility to produce a good product and I hope to see this soon.

MS. LOE: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I also plan on supporting this project. It seems like density is an issue that we have whether it's an affordable housing project or another development project that, because of costs, density has to be increased. I appreciate the neighbors and other people who corresponded on this for coming out. I recognize that this is a change, and that the property has been used in a certain way for a long time. And what I would suggest is organizing and trying to get the City to do something with the City-owned property as far as a park or a green space in providing some of the amenities so that people can use that space as this space has been used, whether it's kids riding bikes or gathering to visit.

MS. LOE: Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Echoing some of Commissioner Stanton's comments, I -- I do believe that we are in new era of public housing where there is a conscious effort to not just warehouse people and not just shuffle them around like they're, you know, pieces on a board. And -- and I was trying to get that on the record, since all of these are transcribed, and I appreciate the fact that that is the case and that these are not another tower complex. These are going to be places where there is a sort of yard. There is a porch. There is, you know, facing the streets and things like that. And, you know, we always talk about infill and cottage standards and that sort of thing for privately owned homes. This seems to be analogous, if not perfectly so, to some of that. And it could be better, but this is certainly better than the original plan, and I do think it's needed.

MS. LOE: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm going to make an assumption without opening up public comment again. I'm going to assume these are row houses; is that --

MS. LOE: Attached, single family.

MR. STANTON: Is that -- but, basically, like in the City. And that, in itself, is a new thing in Columbia that we're kind of easing and the Housing Authority has kind of pushed that envelope. They have some on McBaine that they built years ago, and that's a new thing for us here because we're still country -- country boys and country gals. We need yards and all that kind of stuff. But as we become more urbanized, the row houses and the, you know, attached residential will be more the reality, and the Housing Authority has pushed that envelope. So, yeah.

MS. LOE: Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: If there are no more comments, I would like to make a motion. In Case 46-2021, I move to approve the Kinney Point PD Plan pursuant to minor technical corrections.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none, Mr. Toohey, may we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell. Motion carries 7-0, with 1 abstention.

MR. TOOHEY: That's seven to approve, one abstention. The motion carries.

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

Case Number 49-2021

A request by the City of Columbia to amend Chapter 29, Sections 29-1.11 [Definitions]; 29-2.2 [Base Zoning Districts]; 29-3.2 [Permitted Use Table]; 29-4.1 [Dimensional Summary Table]; 29-4.3 [Parking and Loading]; 29-4.4 [Landscaping, Screening and Tree Preservation]; 29-4.7 [Neighborhood Protection Standards]; 29-5.1 [Subdivision Standards]; 29-5.2 [Subdivision of Land Procedures]; 29-6.1 [Reviewers and Decision-Making Bodies]; 29-6.4 [Specific Regulatory

Procedures]; Appendix A, Section A.1 [Design Standards for Streets, Sidewalks and Bikeways]; and Appendix A.7 [Terminal Streets].

MS. LOE: Did we leave anything out, Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: I don't think so. I think that might hit everything.

MS. LOE: We'll take your report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the recommended text amendments to the UDC.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Very comprehensive presentation. You -- just clarification. Are we making a motion on these all together or each one?

MR. ZENNER: I guess what I would -- the preference would be individual motions in case at Council there is a desire to pull amendments out. That is one reason why the amendment sheets were prepared the way they have been. If the Commission is so inclined, however, given the hour, and there is no discussion related to the amendments A.1 through A.17, we can entertain a motion on the whole to make your evening shorter for you.

MS. LOE: Let's find out if there's any discussion. Any discussion on the motions? Mr. Stanton?

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

MS. LOE: Let's find out if there's any other discussion. Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. Zenner, just a technical question on this. What would be any different than, you know, if we pass all this as one motion, any different than when we passed UDO as one motion, and the City Council is able to go in and make adjustments based upon that as they saw fit?

MR. ZENNER: Well, there is none. The amendment sheet format that was used here this evening is the exact same amendment sheet format that was used for the UDC, so we were trying to cut to the chase. If Council wants to entertain them individually or pull them, they could pull them by individual ordinance. I do not know how the law department will proceed to produce the legislation for this. They may prepare it as 17 separate ordinances or they may prepare it as one with 17 sections, and a section could be pulled out, which is the same as what you have here before you this evening as an amendment. So I don't think a half a dozen, one or the other, it matters. Typically, when we take votes, if there is discussion on any specific matter, for the purposes of the minutes collection, it is much easier for us to be able to have the minutes specifically referencing an amendment to a proposed amendment that staff has presented to you this evening individually instead of in the much broader context. So, again, if there is no desire to discuss any particular amendment specifically, one motion to approve all 17 at this point is fine. Alternatively, if you have one amendment that you want to have discussion on, pull that out of the 17, make a motion to approve the others, and then discuss the one motion that you wanted to discuss in greater detail.

MR. TOOHEY: Just as a follow up, I have no problem if we go ahead and do these as one motion.

MS. LOE: And just for my clarification, even if we vote on it as a whole —

MR. ZENNER: Council can pull it —

MS. LOE: -- 17, Council can do it -- organize it any way they want to. Right?

MR. ZENNER: They could pull it apart. That's correct.

MS. LOE: All right. Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I am in agreement with that, and as a courtesy to the City Clerk, I think we should do it as one motion.

MS. LOE: Well, I'm not seeing anyone identifying any comments on any specific item.

Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm going to go along with this, but I still think we should allow people to have painted signs because we allow people to have painted signs.

MS. LOE: Actually, on the signs, I've been wondering about the ones carved in stone, like Hetzler and -- yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Central Dairy.

MS. LOE: I mean, beyond paint.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Boone Tavern.

MS. LOE: Yes. We're not saying those can't be done. Anyway, we won't go there.

MR. ZENNER: So duly captured in the minutes, and we will investigate that at a later date.

MS. CARROLL: That's -- that's the only one that I -- I could think of that we might pull out separately, but that's -- I don't care. One motion is fine with me.

MS. LOE: One good example I thought of was at MFA out on Paris Road. That is a landmark painted sign. I would miss that if we had to paint it out.

MS. RUSSELL: He's got it.

MS. CARROLL: I would just like to say that they only give me three blanks for motions on this item, so —

MS. LOE: How shall we do this. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Unless there's any more discussion, I would like to entertain a motion, and that motion would be as it relates to Case 49-2021, UDC zoning text amendments, I move to approve the UDC text amendments as presented by staff in its entirety.

MS. RUSSELL: Second that.

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

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

MS. CARROLL: We have nine votes to approve. The motion carries.

MS. LOE: Eight, I believe.

MS. CARROLL: Eight votes to approve, one is absent.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But it still carries. It still carries.

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

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. LOE: There's no public left.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. ZENNER: Your next meeting is February 4th, and as I had mentioned earlier today or earlier this evening, we do not have any regular business items for the February 18th meeting, which means your 7:00 meeting would be cancelled. Given that we have topics that we need to cover in work session, I would respectfully request an additional half an hour to be added, which means that meeting would end at 7:30 instead of your typical 7:00 p.m., so we would have a two-hour work session, 5:30 to 7:30, and we will have one -- for the 18th. That is for the 18th. On the February 4th agenda, however, we do have two cases that are anticipated to come to you, and that would be the Waco North Plat, unless we are otherwise bringing back to you, as I explained earlier, another request to table, and that would be the third tabling request. That would be request of staff due to technical related matters that we are responsible for, not the applicant. And I -- I would suggest to you that the tabling requests that have been asked for by the applicant under the provisions of our rules really have not been the fault of the applicant. They have been more of a scheduling and a conflict issue to be able to get all of the topic fully addressed. So while we blame the applicant for tabling it, it's really not their fault. We're just having difficulty gathering the staff around to discuss, mea culpa, mea culpa. So the other project that we have is 61-2021, 205 West Green Meadows. This is Green Meadows and Green Meadows Circle. This is the Pointe property that was originally referred to as the Godfrey PD, and now is referred to as Midland PD Plan. It is a rezoning from R-1 to PD. The plan has been significantly improved upon. I think the Commission will be happy to see what is being presented, and we will get into much greater discussion as it relates to that when we get to this meeting on the 4th. That is -- our maps, obviously, the Waco North project, and then the Midland PD project, that location that we are familiar with. Those are the cases for the February 4th meeting. As I said, we will revise our calendar and meeting notice software to ensure that the work session for the February 18th meeting shows a two-hour and a cancellation of your regular session for that date. We will have items in March. I can guarantee you that. I've already received several and I know of several that we will be receiving on Monday of this coming week, which is the application deadline, so we will probably be back up to something that's a more typical commission schedule for us that has anywhere between three to five items on an agenda, but we're not looking at any blowout special like the end of December. We only save those till the holiday season. I would suggest to you tonight an observation that I would like to make, and I appreciate the nature in which the Commission and staff were able to work through text

amendments this evening. Obviously, there was a lot of effort put into getting these amendments prepared and working with the Commission, and I hope as we move forward into the zoning changes that we are proposing, a similar commonality in our thought as we bring these text changes forward will prevail. Obviously, the public doesn't seem concerned with these, which is an oddity. I'm sure that they will be more so with some of the zoning changes, so while we have maybe not seen the public this evening, I won't expect to see that moving forward. Again, I appreciate the efforts that you all have put forward. The commentary that was made this evening in regards to our Kinney Point project, we will take up with staff and try to arrive at some more conclusive reporting. I think some things that we do often get asked of by the Commission on the dais or topics that we have typically not considered or information that has not been provided to us. So with each Commission meeting it is often an opportunity for us to garner a little bit of insight into what you, as Commissioners, are specifically yearning to maybe have added. So please bear with us a little bit as we continue to try to fulfill your needs. And often, if there's something specific that you may note as an observation to an omission possibly, always feel free to either contact myself or contact the project manager who is responsible for that project to let them be aware of an observation so it does not look as though there may be any type of animus here during the session between Commissioners and staff as it relates to the questioning. I realize you're all seeking to get answers. Unfortunately, sometimes it does not often get presented or taken in by our staff that way, and we're trying to our best to serve you all, and I think what we're learning as we go through these sessions is what your expectations are each and every meeting. With that, that's all I have to offer for this evening, and I thank you very much.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

X. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. RUSHING: I want to reiterate my appreciation, it's already been expressed, for the clarity of the amendments presentation. It was sweet and simple, to the point. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I have a motion.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MR. STANTON: I move to adjourn.

MS. BURNS: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Burns. We are adjourned. Thanks, everybody.

(Off the record.)

(The meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.)