



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 22, 2017
7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Council Chambers
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. STRODTMAN: Good evening. I will go ahead, and I would like to call the June 22nd, 2017, City of Columbia Planning and Zoning Commission to order. May we have a roll call, please.

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

Present: 8 - Tootie Burns, Dan Harder, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Anthony Stanton, Rusty Strodman, Brian Toohey and Michael MacMann

Excused: 1 - Lee Russell

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Mr. Smith, is there any changes to our agenda?

MR. SMITH: No changes to the -- to the agenda.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. STRODTMAN: Approval of minutes, Commissioners, from our June 8th, 2017 meeting. Are there any corrections or notes needed to those minutes? I see none. I'll take a motion -- or a thumbs up. We'll do a thumbs up. Everybody have their thumbs up? I see a unanimous thumbs up. Ms. Loe? Approval?

MS. LOE: Abstain.

MR. STRODTMAN: Abstain. I guess you weren't here. That's a good -- good point. Everyone but Ms. Loe approve the minutes from June 8th.

IV. TABLING REQUESTS**Case # 17-132**

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of Phil and Erin Teeple (owners) to rezone 4206 Savoy Drive from R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) and A (Agricultural) to R-MF (Multiple-family Dwelling District). The 3.99-acre subject site is located on the east side of Strawn Road, approximately 900 feet north of Worley Street. **(This item was tabled at the June 8, 2017 meeting)**

Before we get started, I -- at this time I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte commiss-- communications prior to this meeting related to the Case 17-132, please disclose that now, so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just to reiterate from last time, because we -- I have individuals briefly approach me from the development community and the neighborhood here. And -- but -- just, you know, sharing their views with me very briefly.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you Mr. MacMann. Is there any additional Commissioners? I see none. I thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Staff, may we have a case report, please -- staff report, please?

MR. SMITH: Yes. So the first item on the agenda tonight is a tabling request for a -- Case No. 17-132. This is the second request. It was tabled from the previous meeting to June 22nd, tonight. The request is for the tabling of this to the August 10th meeting, which would be the extent of the two months, which is generally allowed per P and Z procedures. Staff is recommending approval of that tabling request.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Smith. As is in our past, this is not a public item, but we will open it for discussion. So as we did in the last -- two weeks ago, if there would be an organized group, I would like to ask those organized groups of homeowner's associations, presidents or spokespeople will be fine, and then, obviously, the -- the applicant. So if somebody would like to start the process? Please -- please give us your name and address.

MR. CROCKETT: Chairman and members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. Here tonight on behalf of Phil and Erin Teeple, who are the applicants for this rezoning request. And -- and, again, we're before you tonight asking for a tabling of two months. Two weeks ago, I believe, this request came before this Commission asking for a two-week tabling. It was at that time that my -- that my client was approaching the neighbors to discuss the situation. I think there was some substantial opposition at that time, and so he approached the neighbors to have a

meeting to have a meeting to discuss the proposal. And we asked for two weeks in order to have that meeting -- meeting, excuse me. About a week ago, my client conducted that meeting -- had a meeting in one of the homes of -- of the neighbors. There were several people in attendance to that meeting, and during that time they asked for additional information. And there may have been some -- I was not in attendance, but it -- my client was, and I believe there was some -- maybe some misunderstanding or some -- some misinformation about regarding the new Unified Development Code. And so they've asked for some information to be presented to them, is my -- as my understanding is. And so my client desires to have additional time in order to present that information to them, compile that information, kind of give them an idea of what this site could look like with regards to the neighborhood protection clauses in the -- in the UDC. There's a lot of information in there that would protect a neighborhood like this, especially given the -- the adjacent residential zonings. This is not uncommon to ask for a tabling of this nature, as you are certainly aware. Many times applicants come before this Commission and we don't have time. We have a closing or we have something coming up, we -- we want to rush through. This is a situation that we do have time. We are asking this Commission to give us that time and allow us the additional time in order to present the information back to the neighbors that they've requested. And so that's what we're asking for tonight. This is not uncommon. The alternative would be, you know, well, why don't we just withdraw the request, go talk to the neighbors and then present a new request at a later time. At that -- if we did that, I think that we would still come out about the same time before this Commission. However, when we withdraw and then resubmit, we go back to the Planning Department and submit a new application, and they have to process it as a new request. That means distributing it to 12 or 14 different utility providers and departments. Those folks have to go through and do a thorough review and comment period back. It just takes a lot of resources and time of City and utility providers for something that we think that if we simply table it for two months, we're in hopes that we can come back with something that -- that's more appropriate. And so, again, this is not uncommon for this type of situation, and we respectfully ask your consideration for that request.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, is there any questions for this speaker? Yes. Ms. Loe. I'm sorry. Go ahead. Ms. Burns; I'm sorry.

MS. BURNS: Thank you. I appreciate your presentation, Mr. Crockett. I think what was uncommon at our meeting two weeks ago is neither you nor the applicant was

available for questioning.

MR. CROCKETT: And I apologize for that. That was -- that was my fault. I have never had a -- a tabling request that wasn't granted. And I advised my client incorrectly, and I take responsibility for that for not showing up and not being present at that meeting. And for that, I take the responsibility for that.

MS. BURNS: Well, I appreciate that. Having been on this Commission for about three and a half years, I had never seen that happen before. So when you talk about uncommon activities, that was uncommon as -- as far as my experience.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. And I -- and I apologize. And I apologize to the neighbors, as well, for not getting that out there to them in -- in advance.

MS. BURNS: And I appreciate that. I'll be curious to hear what the neighbors have to say as far as how they want to handle this tonight.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay.

MS. BURNS: But thank you for appearing tonight.

MR. CROCKETT: All right. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Crockett, in your estimation, did you all make progress in the meeting?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, again, I was not at that meeting. My client was, and I think he can speak a little more direct to that point, if you -- if you don't mind.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I'll wait till he --

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: -- comes up.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Any additional questions? Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. TEEPLE: Hi. I'm Phil Teeple, the applicant. I reside at 4206 Savoy Drive. I just wanted to give a little bit of a background. When I started this process, I did go to my immediately adjacent neighbors to discuss my proposal. I didn't really get any negative feedback -- generally, pretty positive. The -- whenever I submitted this, obviously, I received a lot of feedback and I sought a meeting with the neighbors, as Mr. Crockett said. They did not want to have a meeting until after the first P and Z meeting, till they heard your decision. And I tried to say, well, we want to meet first and -- and try to get this figured out. So they did grant me a meeting after the -- after we got the first tabling request. And we had a meeting, and there were about nine members in the neighborhood there. And, you know, I gave them a little history of the -- of the site. You

know, I bought this -- well, this was a school since about 1834, so before the University of Missouri annexed it into the City in the '70s, as is, I believe, in the staff report, too. We -- I purchased it in 2009. Before that, it had been a school, even whenever the subdivision had -- had been developed around it. Mr. Schauf has been -- been selling off his old farm to develop Vintage Falls. And, you know, I've -- I've lived there just to see Savoy Drive built behind me, the houses built across the street. And then, you know, the Smith Ridge condos -- Mr. Atkins is going to eventually build to the -- to the south and east of me, as well. So I -- I told them, I -- I just want the same regard as they have had to -- to develop. And we tried to look for different ways that we -- we could accommodate that. They had a lot of questions that I did not have the answer to. And I -- I really didn't have good answers for them, and they -- and they were good questions. They wanted to know what it was going to look like -- you know, what kind of -- what kind of houses, or were these going to be apartment buildings, was there going to be -- how the trash service was going to be handled. If they had kids, how would busses access the development. What about the quality of construction -- you know, how was it going to impact the -- the streets of their neighborhood. And, you know, I -- I deal with this kind of thing every day, looking at plans and stuff. So, you know, until I had a chance to go home and think about it, I -- you know, I -- I really could see it from their -- their point of view that -- you know, if -- if they don't have something tangible to see -- you know, some -- some idea of a plan, it's -- it's very hard for them to understand what -- what I want to do here. You know, at -- at the end of the meeting, I -- I asked them to provide -- you know, what do they want to see here. And, you know, we'd been meet-- been talking for about 50 minutes or so, and Mr. Quillo cut everybody off and said, Don't -- don't talk to him about what you to -- what you want to see. Don't help him try to get his application approved. And then he -- he further threatened and intimidated me by saying that he would have even more people show up if I tried to -- to table this another time, so that -- that left a bit of a bad taste in my mouth. But there were -- there were seven or eight other people in that room that I -- I think I can make progress with. You know, I -- I live in that neighborhood, and I just ask you to give me the time to work this through with the neighbors.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Commissioners, is there -- there any questions for this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Teeple, thank you for being here today. In your mind, what's different -- what will be the difference between tabling this now, and withdrawing it and resubmitting it?

MR. TEEPLE: I -- I think the difference is the -- the tabling allows us a chance to

show that we're -- we're going to work together. We're going to try to move forward with this. If we withdraw it, it's just pushed off till another -- another date, I think. I -- I -- you know, I -- I think Tim said that, you know, the -- the process either way -- you know, it affects staff. I don't know if that really matters that much to you -- to you all or -- or -- but it -- it gives us a chance to work with the neighbors.

MR. MACMANN: If I may, what are the -- I -- you mentioned a few things briefly. What are the stumbling blocks at this time?

MR. TEEPLE: I think the biggest thing --

MR. MACMANN: (Inaudible) -- I don't want you to speak for someone else.

MR. TEEPLE: -- they -- they kept saying, Well, we don't have a plan. You -- you presented this red line on a piece of paper. And it's hard for them to visualize how is this going to be -- Mr. Quillo was mentioning seven- or ten-story apartment buildings. We -- we all know that can't be built. I -- and this is not -- not anything that I would ever want to do, but I -- I also sent out to the neighborhood an actual copy of the section of the new ordinance that lists the approved uses for an R-MF property -- the section that shows the height and the -- the yard areas. But, you know, that -- that's still not going to be enough to -- to show them adequately here's what -- here's what this is really going to look like. It's going to look like something like -- you know, Smithton Ridge across the street, or maybe it's going to look like Vintage Falls. There -- there's options and it's not going to be scary and ugly, or the worst thing in their -- in their imagination. It's -- it's going to be beautiful -- something beautiful.

MR. MACMANN: Just -- let me follow up to -- with my last question. It's sounds as if you haven't completely sold them on the quality of this project. And it sounds like you haven't really submitted much to them for -- well, to certainly enough of them to convince them; is that -- is that a fair assessment?

MR. TEEPLE: I -- I'm sorry. What was the question?

MR. MACMANN: My question is as follows: It sounds like you still have a lot of work to do with the neighbors.

MR. TEEPLE: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: And you don't have anything -- or you've yet to submit something to them that they could review. And that's your -- that's why you're requesting a tabling, so you can get something together to give to them?

MR. TEEPLE: Yes. Because ultimately what we're talking about here is land use. And I -- I deal with that every day, it makes sense to me. I understand where other people, they hear it's going to be an R-MF district. What does that mean? You know, they're talking about -- they mentioned, well, you can build a commercial there. No, you

-- you can't build commercial. You're not going to have a hotel. You're not going to have a filling station. It's not going to be industrial or business, where it's -- it's going to be -- and I don't have any particular plans. I mean, that's -- and -- and it takes time to develop a plan. And it -- that's why we're asking for the tabling request.

MR. MACMANN: I have no further questions. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions? I see none. Thank you,

Mr. Teeple. Small -- small housekeeping matter before we get started on -- that I meant to mention earlier. I would like to try to keep it to three minutes each so that we are all fair to each other. And, again, if we do decide to table, as I mentioned earlier, it will go to, you know -- well, I -- we won't go into that. We'll just keep talking. So if you guys want to come for-- anybody else would like to come forward and -- for or against the tabling request. Not the actual project, but the actual tabling request.

MR. MALON: Yes, sir. There are two of us. There's two homeowner's associations involved in this, so we have two speakers.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, sir. And don't -- don't forget your -- I like -- I liked to hear your name and address.

MR. MALON: My name's Richard Malon. I live at 3801 Ivanhoe Boulevard in the Villas at Vintage Falls. And I'm here to speak on behalf of the Board of Plat 1. We did not ask for any additional information. We are opposed to the rezoning and we're opposed to this request to table. We did have -- first of all, we think the owner had more than adequate time to come up with a plan before he ever submitted this whole thing in the first place. When we met with the homeowners, there seems to -- or with the applicant, it seems like there's a whole different perspective on how the meeting went. Because in our estimation, it was a 100 percent on our side opposition to bring this zoning into our neighborhood -- right into our neighborhood. We made it very clear we were opposed to this. He attempted to explain to us how nice apartments are, and we told him that we didn't think apartments are nice, that there's more than enough apartments in the city already, and that we -- we're opposed to bringing any kind of multi-family rental properties right into our neighborhood. We did not ask for any additional information. That having to said [sic], we don't see any reason why this should be put off for two months to cobble together some plan that we're going to be opposed to. When we left the meeting, the entire group was 100 percent opposed to this rezoning. And it would be a waste, we think, of time for the Commission, for the owner, for all of us, to put this off for two months, or whatever, and come back with some sort of a sketch or plan or whatnot, because we are opposed to the rezoning, period. We don't care what it

looks like, we just don't want it in our neighborhood. So with that said, we urge that you request -- that you turn down this request to table, you proceed with the hearing and deny the rezoning request. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. Commissioners, questions? I see none. Thank you, sir.

MR. QUILLO: Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Art Quillo. I live at 4203 Fritz Court. I'm the president of the village at -- the Villas at Vintage Falls Plat 2 Homeowner's Association. In relation to the request for tabling, due to the applicant's statement, the reason is our HOA Boards requested more information. I don't remember anyone asking for more information at our joint meeting. I'm sorry. I don't recall anyone having any position, other than a strong opposition, no matter what the plan the cap-- excuse me -- the applicant or Crockett Engineer-- Engineering might come up with. Our HOA is against the tabling today and against the change -- zoning change no matter what. As to the plan, the applicant stated several times at our joint meeting that he has no plans to do anything until his youngest child graduates from high school in about 15 years or so. How can a Commission agree to pass on a plan drawn up in 2017 that will not be acted on for 15 years? To say that makes no sense, obviously, is an understatement. Villas at Vintage Falls were designed and begun as a planned community in 2003. It envisioned and has attracted long-time Columbia senior citizens, most of which have bought their last home in this neighborhood planning to live out their lives in a quiet community suited to their stage of life. The applicant bought this property, I think, in 2009 as a single-family residence. Since 2003, over 100 individuals -- and I guess more than that, couples -- have bought homes in the neighborhood. None of them made that purchase under the assumption that a single homeowner could alter their lifestyle and potentially devalue their biggest investment -- and probably their last investment. I don't understand how the Commission could allow the wishes of a single person trying to take advantage of a -- of the size of his single-family plot he bought seven years ago in the middle of a planned senior community begun seven years before he moved there, can win over the wishes of over 100 neighborhood homeowners and the recommendation the Commission's own staff -- which I believe has recommended against. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, sir. Anybody -- any additional speakers like to come forward? Yes, ma'am. Come on.

MS. WALTHER: My name is Carol Walther. I live at 4200 Savoy Drive. I'm right next to the red line there. And I believe Mr. Teeple stated that he came and talked to

neighbors about this. He never came and talked to me about this, ever. And I don't -- I think I saw some other people shrugging their shoulders when he said that he talked to us. He did not come talk to me, or anything. Just wanted to state that. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, ma'am. Commissioners, any questions? Thank you. Anyone else like to come forward? Yes, sir.

MR. BREWER: Thank you. My name is Ray Brewer, 3907 Savoy Drive. And I would speak in opposition of the tabling. At our last meeting when we were present, we were told by staff that they were opposed to the rezoning, but they were in favor of the tabling in order to provide an opportunity for the two groups to get together and have communication. We were expecting, then, to have that kind of communication that would validate the tabling effort. We weren't pleased to have it tabled, but we were willing. Now we come and discover that there's been no further communication, simply indicating maybe now better we understand what you want to know, although our Board says no, that was not communicated to them. So we believe that we should not table, but instead allow them to withdraw their application or let us proceed and handle it tonight. I've come to two of these meetings. I'm not able to come to the next. Have a lot invested in my home and I would suggest that we deny this tabling request. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. Commissions, any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, sir. Anyone else like to come forward? I see none. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, discussion? Questions? Clarification needed? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Clarification.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. LOE: If we do not approve tabling, do we hear this case tonight?

MR. STRODTMAN: My understanding would be yes. Mr. Smith, is that the correct statement?

MR. SMITH: Mr. Teddy, you want to --

MR. TEDDY: If -- if the applicant desires to proceed, they may decide to withdraw. It -- it's up to them. If they do proceed, I'd advise that whatever decision you make at the end of the hearing, be sure you're clear about the reasons for your votes, whether they're yes or no.

MR. STRODTMAN: Just to continue that clarification, would the -- would the case go-- would we go ahead and go-- go immediately to that, ask the applicant to what their decision is and then move forward? Or would it be pushed to a different part of our agenda?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. It -- it -- pardon --

MR. SMITH: I think it would go to the public hearing portion of the agenda. So we would proceed with the subdivision portion as we typically do first.

MR. STRODTMAN: Perfect. Thank you. Did -- Ms. Loe, any -- any additional questions? Clarification?

MS. LOE: No further questions.

MR. STRODTMAN: For staff or anybody else? Commissioners?

MS. LOE: I'll jump in --

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Ms. Loe.

MS. LOE: -- for discussion that I -- I have to admit I missed the last meeting. I was out of town. And I did not completely read this package since I saw it was requested to be tabled, so I've been skimming the documents while listening to the testimony here. That said, it appears very preliminary. I'm -- I'm not seeing any proposed plans or plats, so it is hard -- I can understand why there's some confusion about what's being a-- proposed at this time. Am I correct in coming to that conclusion or is there more of a plan in place than what I'm seeing?

MR. SMITH: No. There would be no plan required at this stage. They can request a zoning or a rezoning in this fashion really without any further documentation, plans, permits that would be required. So they could continue to use the property, even if it's rezoned, for the next 10 or 20 years without doing anything with it.

MS. LOE: Understood. But we usually get a rezoning request in conjunction with a project proposal or something -- at least at this Commission.

MR. TEDDY: It -- it's a base zoning district request, so no plan is required for that. And your evaluation is on the general characteristics of that zoning. In other words, all the potential use within that zoning classification, not a specific plan. If it's a specific plan, you know, that can be presented as an exhibit that shows that perhaps a project is constructible. But in base zoning, it's not a planned district, so they're not going to be bound to any particular plan.

MS. LOE: Understood. With the lack of that, though, I -- I still would like to just say we typically see zoning -- rezoning requests coming through in conjunction with specific projects that have a specific use in mind or a specific project in mind, and that's what's tripping the rezoning request. I have to admit I'm not quite sure what's motivating this rezoning request, except the fact that the applicant appears to think they may want to do a multi-family project at some point; am I correct?

MR. TEDDY: I think you'd have to rely on their statement on that.

MS. LOE: Correct. I find that very preliminary, and as such would be -- my

sentiment would be to not table and ask them to reapply when they have a better sense of what they actually are planning to develop.

MS. RUSHING: And --

MR. STRODTMAN: Or -- or hear the case as we would if they so choose to --

MS. LOE: Uh-huh. Yes. Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- for us this evening and we would push it into the public hearing portion. Yes. Yes.

MS. LOE: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Ms. -- anything additionally, Ms. Loe? Okay. Yes?

MS. RUSHING: And I would agree, because I think right now what I would assume with this rezoning request with nothing else in front of me, would be the densest development that they could do with the least amenities that they could get by with. I mean, I have to assume that it's going to be as little as they -- I mean, as much or as little as they can get by with because we're just rezoning it without any indication of how it's going to be used. So I would have to assume the use is going to be the densest use that they can use it for with the least amenities that they can get by with.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Rushing. Just for clarification, we would see it again -- I mean, the project wouldn't -- they wouldn't be able to build what he wants just because we rezone it. I think it's -- as Mr. Teddy mentioned, I think it's important for us to think about the zoning request and not, you know -- but also think about all the things that are included within --

MS. RUSHING: Right.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- R-MF.

MS. RUSHING: If they're telling us --

MR. STRODTMAN: And it could be the highest density, so that's a good point. But we would have an opportunity to -- to see a plan at some point. But it is a good point that we don't have that today in front of us to help us, reassure us, as well as the -- the neighbors. Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Yes. I plan to vote to deny the tabling of this request, because I feel like progress -- there was an opportunity for progress and I don't see progress. And I'd rather see this moved forward or the applicant withdraw his request -- their request because I think we need to move forward with this.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a question for staff, just real quick. This is a single plat with two zonings on it?

MR. SMITH: It's a single parcel, so with two different zoning designations on it.

Yeah. It was -- there's some history there, but they were annexed separately. And so --

MR. MACMANN: An-- and that's fine. I'm just -- just a real -- real quick question for Mr. Teddy. This is one of the things we're going to clean up going forward. Right? These multiple zonings on one plan or one parcel?

MR. TEDDY: Well, we usually recommend avoiding split zoning on a single parcel. Yes.

MR. MACMANN: Right.

MR. TEDDY: Unless it fits into a plan scheme.

MR. MACMANN: That -- that's --

MR. TEDDY: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: -- I was not sure whether we had two different plats or not. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm going to play the bad guy. In theory, this is really a technical issue. And we can get into what people have the right to do with their property, and he does have the right to rezone it.

MS. RUSHING: No, he doesn't.

MR. STANTON: Technically, I think my position would be this. I -- I would like to hear the case. I still have the option to table it if I'm not convinced or I need more information, but I think maybe we need to hear the case and -- and put it out there and have a little discussion and see if there's a win-win that could be on the table. But I'm going to tell you, last week's absence of anybody on the other side weighs greatly with me -- heavily, because we have a lot of people here that have an opinion about this case. And I felt like if this is very important, that there should have been some more work done. So I would like to hear it and still have an option to table it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Just point of clarification. Mr. Teddy, would the project come back before the Planning and Zoning Commission if the proposal met all the requirements of the UDC?

MR. TEDDY: Would it come back --

MS. LOE: Correct.

MR. TEDDY: -- if it met all the require--

MS. LOE: If -- if --

MR. TEDDY: You mean if it --

MS. LOE: -- it was rezoned as R-MF, is there any reason it would come back?

MR. TEDDY: Possibly platting.

MR. SMITH: Platting.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. I believe it needs to be platted for access; is that correct?

MR. SMITH: I believe that's the case. It would need to come back and final plat the property unless they can show that it meets the -- the current definition of a legal lot, which I don't believe it does. But that would be the only additional entitlement that they would need to get. There would be no additional site plans or building plans or anything that comes back before P and Z.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Other than for a final, because I was under the impression it wasn't a final, so that we would see it one more time for a final plat request at some later date.

MR. SMITH: Yes. A final plat would -- would come back.

MS. LOE: But that would not indicate number of units or --

MR. SMITH: No. It would --

MS. LOE: -- buildings or --

MR. SMITH: -- just be creating the -- the legal lot out of the current parcels.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, is there any further discussion needed or would there be a -- a motion made to either table or grant the table request from the applicant, or give the applicant a chance to either continue with the discussion later this evening during public or give the applicant a choice to -- a chance to pull the project off and resubmit at a later date. Leave that up to the applicant. Yes, Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm just speaking out loud, but outside looking in, if the applicant were just to stay with residential, would that quiet the fire -- made a project that fit within the zoning that currently exists? If we discuss that, I just kind of want to throw that out there for any future discussion.

MR. STRODTMAN: And I would say that would be for future discussion, because as of today, it's not; it's being sought as R-MF. And so that would be for a different time to discuss, maybe even later this evening.

MR. STANTON: All right.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any motions for discussion?

MR. TOOHEY: I'll go ahead and make a motion.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Toohey.

MR. TOOHEY: I'll go ahead and make a motion to table Case No. 17-132.

MR. STRODTMAN: We have a motion for a table -- to approve the table request. Do we have a second? Looks like we do not have a second for that. Would anyone like to resubmit a motion that we can get a second on? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I would like to request that we deny tabling on Case 17-132, a request by Crockett Engineering Consultants on behalf of Phil and Erin Teeple to rezone 3206 Savoy Drive.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns, for that motion. Do we have a second?

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Rushing, thank you for that second. Commissioners, we have -- a motion has been put on the table and a second. Is there any discussion or clarification needed to this motion?

MR. TOOHEY: I do have one question.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: I -- I believe it was brought up at the last meeting that it's customary for the Planning and Zoning Commission to grant two tablings. So is that --

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, that is true. That is -- that -- it is true that it is customary, but it is not a requirement.

MR. TOOHEY: I agree. I just want to bring that up --

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, it is.

MR. TOOHEY: -- because that was mentioned at the last meeting.

MR. STRODTMAN: It -- it -- to summarize it really briefly, rules of procedure is any -- we will grant up to two within a two-month period of the first. Anything after that, it -- they -- we typically would say something different. So -- but it -- we traditionally have, but not -- I can't say in all history, but it -- but in most cases we have. But we typically haven't got this type of discussion either for a tabling request. Commissioners, additional discussion needed on the motion and second? I see none. I would ask Ms. Burns to do a roll call at her convenience.

MS. BURNS: Yes. To recommend denying the tabling request.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Mr. Toohey.

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. So Planning and Zoning's recommendation for tabling Case 17-132 to the August 10th, 2017 meeting was denied. So we would move that to a later point of the meeting for the public portion, and at that time the applicant -- the applicant can tell us --

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, if I may?

MR. STRODTMAN: Would that be proper to allow Mr. Crockett to come before?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Crockett, do you have information that is relevant to this?

MR. CROCKETT: I do. I understand that tabling request. I understand moving it further back in the subdivision process tonight. I will inform the Commission that it is our desire to withdraw that request. Given that, and given the fact that it is further down in the agenda, I would respectfully ask that it be modified to go ahead and withdraw it at this time. That way, the neighbors don't have to sit around for one or two more proceedings until it comes to that item.

MR. STRODTMAN: And for clarification for staff, we would just accept that request for removal --

MR. TEDDY: I think you can rely on his statement that it is now considered withdrawn.

MR. STRODTMAN: And then we will not bring it up at a later time so that it -- the group could leave if they so desire? And we won't discuss it at a later time?

MR. TEDDY: No. I think discussion will now be closed on this matter. And then if they desire to bring back a proposal, that would be a new application. There would be new notice made.

MR. STRODTMAN: Correct. Correct. Okay. Just -- so for clarification -- because, obviously, you can tell this is -- I've done it for six years and this is our first time. So as it -- it just happened, the applicant has removed the project from -- for consideration, so it -- it has been removed. So as a result, the applicant, at some later date, could and may resubmit something to the City and it would start the process over, just like it did this time, with notification to the to the neighborhood -- you know, the homeowners association. And we would have a chance to review it and -- and hopefully it wouldn't be a tabling request, and it would actually be something that both sides have discussed and have agreed to. That would be the ideal, or -- or not. That's not what we have a choice to. So with that, as the applicant was generous to do, you're -- you're welcome to leave if you'd like, or we always are loving citizens to be here for educational purposes and support. We'll give the room just a couple minutes for clearing out and then we'll get started on the next case.

V. SUBDIVISION REQUESTS**Case # 17-100**

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of THD-REB Properties, LLC (owner) for approval of a 59-lot preliminary plat revision on R-1 (On-family Dwelling District) zoned property, to be known as "The Vineyards, Preliminary Plat #3". The 24.1-acre subject site is two separate parcels, one located on the south side of Elk Park Drive, approximately 150 feet east of Berkley Drive, and the other on the south side of State Highway WW, approximately 800 feet west of Stone Mountain Parkway.

MR STRODTMAN: Thank everyone for their patience for that. We will just go ahead and get started with our subdivision requests. At this time, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 17-100, please disclose that now, so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. I see none.

MR. STRODTMAN: 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 revised preliminary plat for The Vineyards, Preliminary Plat #3.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Commissioners, any questions for staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Planner Smith, I noticed this is moderate to steep slopes, pretty heavily wooded right now. Can you talk to me just a little bit about storm water on this?

MR. SMITH: I could say that it meets the current storm water ordinance 12A with the --

MR. MACMANN: So everything is going to stay --

MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. Say that again?

MR. MACMANN: Go -- please go -- I -- I interrupted you. I'm sorry. Please --

MR. SMITH: That's fine. They -- they have been reviewed to meet current ordinance standards for storm water. I couldn't speak necessarily to the specifics of the design of that system. This is a revised preliminary, so we don't have final construction plans at this time.

MR. MACMANN: I -- I just want to a -- a standing concern of mine.

MR. SMITH: Sure.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you very much.

MR. SMITH: No problem.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional questions? Yes, Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Ballentine Lane -- if you go back to the plan. Just -- where does that connect through on the north end or -- yes.

MR. SMITH: I apologize. Where's Ballentine Lane?

MS. LOE: On the east.

MR. SMITH: On the east. Of this side?

MS. LOE: Correct.

MR. TEDDY: Northeast.

MR. SMITH: Here. So this portion does connect into the undeveloped -- or underdeveloped portion of the property to the west. This is not owned by the current developer. It's kind of an island in the middle of the vineyard. So they are required -- or staff did recommend and require that they stub to that to account for future development of the site. So there is street connectivity.

MS. LOE: So the expectation is that Elk Park Drive will connect through?

MR. SMITH: Correct. Yes, that is the plan.

MS. LOE: And if that doesn't happen?

MR. SMITH: If it redevelops, it should happen. If it never redevelops, then this is what we will have.

MS. LOE: And what we have as presented meets code requirements?

MR. SMITH: Correct.

MS. LOE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Good question. Same one I had. Mr. Smith, the last -- last question I have. The -- the cul-de-sac in the bottom left-hand corner -- the southwest corner?

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: You mentioned that it's -- it -- not planned for development today, but it would be for future; is that -- am I getting that correctly?

MR. SMITH: The large Lot 52 to the west?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. Right. Yes.

MR. SMITH: So in its current form, Lot 52 is shown on the preliminary plat, so they could plat that as one large lot. What's more likely to happen is that the PD portion of that will develop in the future with a single-family residential development. At that stage, then they would have to come back to the P and Z for that development plan.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Any additional questions? I see none. As is in past practice, it is not a public hearing. But if there is -- if there's folks in the crowd that

would like to give us relevant information to this, we would ask that you come forward, give us your name and address.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett. Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I believe Mr. Smith did a -- did a very thorough job with the staff report illustrating this revised preliminary plat. Again, this is the third preliminary plat for these parcels. I was involved at the very first preliminary plat that happened many years ago. At that time -- it was the intent of this developer at that time to reserve this area for different uses. The area on the -- on the east side, he thought maybe a church, maybe as a light commercial, something along those lines. And the area on the west, maybe a PUD or multi-family, something along that -- in that nature. Since that time, the property has changed hands a few times, and I think that the intent and the desire of the developers have changed. The current property owner is under contract with my client -- my client is to purchase basically what you see here -- not all of the property that goes to the west, but basically what you see here. And it's his desire to build single-family residential. I think it fits in very well. It's -- it fulfills the obligation and the intent of the current owner when they re-preliminary -- re-preliminary to the property to re-subdivide it for further development. Talk about a couple comments. Mr. MacMann, you talked about the storm water. Yes, we fully intend to comply with the storm water regulations for the City of Columbia. We can do that on the property. It's been reviewed by the engineers and they are fully confident that we can fulfill those obligations. With regard to Ballentine Drive, Ms. Loe, we've -- we've asked the City engineers on multiple -- multiple occasions, as well as MoDOT, to see if we could have an access. That would be a great point to have an access -- another point of access for that development. However, given the location on WW with relation to the curve and other access points, they've said that's not going to be appropriate. Furthermore, we have access to Elk Park Drive, which is existing. It's in place, and we will have a direct access going up through Elk Park that will be access to a future signalized intersection. We think that's important. It gives all the folks in -- you know, the 100 lots that are in the existing portion of the Vineyards that's on the north side of the creek, it gives them a secondary ingress and egress -- and more importantly, at a signalized intersection. As so we think that's important. And so with that, we believe it's a -- a fairly straightforward request from that point on, and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions for this speaker?

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: I see none. Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Any additional speakers in the audience that would like to come forward?

MR. EGGEMEYER: Hi. My name is Jim Eggemeyer; I'm at 2008 Bates Creek Drive. And I just left a HOA meeting just to come to this meeting to ask a couple questions. And we're not aga-- I'm not against progress and I only represent the HOA in that I am a member. Is -- is that -- on the right-hand side of the Ballentine Street, I was really concerned about the size of the lots in comparison to the size of the lots that are in the other part of the -- the Vineyards Subdivision. Some of those are even, like, 50 -some feet in width and they're maybe 150 in length. It's very hard to build a nice aesthetically pleasing house on such a skinny lot. So that was my first concern. And the other -- second concern was that that road does end at a dead end on a person's -- near a person's farm who -- it's probably in the grand scheme of things to eventually zone that also. But to be honest, I -- they may resist that. I'm not sure. And if -- that's all -- basically all I had to say, so.

MR. STRODTMAN: Well, I'll try to give you a -- a little clarification -- and, staff, feel free. My assumption is, is all the lots are legal, conforming lot sizes. So by code and by the City's definition of a legal lot, those would meet -- that size that you referenced would meet that definition and would be a legal size. And then it would be up to the engineer and the architects and the applicant to design homes that would fit on that size of a lot, though they may be different size than what you see, you know, in existing. But they're still a legal conforming lot. And then, I -- I forget the second -- I had to -- I --

MS. LOE: The dead end.

MR. STRODTMAN: The dead end. Interesting that you brought that up, because I -- we -- we had the same question. I -- I think we -- you know, we had a clarification of staff as to why that is. And, you know, it -- it's easy to understand that the applicant doesn't own the piece in the middle and so they can't connect. But from the City's standpoint, as Mr. Smith had, I think, referenced, if it is redeveloped, more than likely the next owner -- again, it's just more -- you know, it's just -- there's no guarantee. It would be redeveloped into a higher use, which should be the R-1 -- the similar use that we're seeing on both sides, and it would be connected. And at that time, the infrastructure's there. It -- it's much more affordable. They don't have to go back and get ownership -- you know, land from the neighbors next door to continue the road. They're not going to have to move a house. They're not going to have a dead end in a situation that they -- we wish we could have fixed. But at the same time, that dead end could sit there for 100 -plus years and always be a dead end -- that those neighbors that are at that end need to understand it may always be a dead end or someday it may be a through street. But today, it's a dead end and I'm assuming it would be built in such a way where it -- they can't get into the -- the A-1 lot, the middle lot, you know, so it -- that they're not turning

around in a field or something. But --

MR. EGGEMEYER: Could I ask one more thing?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes.

MR. EGGEMEYER: On a previous rendition of the right-hand corner, there was a -- was a cul-de-sac that came off of there that offered maybe a few more lots of a decent size, compared to the current rendition that was shown that -- it had -- had a cul-de-sac that came out halfway up the new addition -- a new road there, onto the right. Yeah, right there.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: Predominately -- and I'll just speak for staff. Predominately, the City frowns upon cul-de-sacs. Even though as a resident and a citizen that lives on a cul-de-sac, I love my cul-de-sac. But from a -- fire trucks, trash trucks, ambulances, all other services, they don't -- we don't like cul-de-sacs. So from a planning standpoint connectivity, everybody's connected, everybody can flow. You're not segregating everybody -- you know, everybody can work through the neighborhoods and the communities -- walkable, et cetera, is very important. So this is thinking forward with the dead ends, but there is no guarantee that it will ever happen. But if it does happen, we fought -- it is as forward as we can to try to think that through, but there's no guarantee.

MR. EGGEMEYER: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: It would -- you would think it would make it more favorable for the owner to do that, but that owner doesn't have to.

MR. EGGEMEYER: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: There's no requirement. Any additional questions for this speaker? Thank you, sir.

MR. EGGEMEYER: Thank you.

MS. RIGGERT: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Beth Riggert; I live at 1605 Ballentine Lane, which is three lots south of the red line. I attended the March 28th Public Information Meeting that Mr. Smith provided information, as well as Mr. Crockett's associate, Mr. Green. This is not the proposal that was shown to us at that time. As the previous speaker noted, the right-hand corner had a different configuration, and the left side was dramatically different. It did not have either the cul-de-sac or the stubby road that also terminates at a privately owned farm. This is also the first time that I think any of us in the Vineyards have heard any proposal of any residential development going north -- or going on the north side of what will be the City park. And it appears that now the plan might be to try and connect the Vineyards to El Chaparral, and that is not

something that I -- I think anyone in the Vineyards has heard before. So I guess that's my comment. And my question is, because I realize this is not on the public hearing portion of the agenda, so I don't -- I guess I'm asking what opportunity might there be for residents to be heard before a -- a proposal is finally adopted by the City P and Z?

MR. STRODTMAN: So --

MS. RIGGERT: If this is not the appropriate time, my apologies.

MR. STRODTMAN: Staff, would you -- Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: All I can tell you, as you stated earlier, this isn't a public hearing for plats. Plats typically do not have public hearings associated with them. They are typically reviewed for consistency with the subdivision regulations, and if they are generally consistent with that, then they are generally approved. So the portion to the west that I think you are referring to is a little different. It is zoned P-D, which is a Planned District. So any development there would be required to come to the Planning and Zoning Commission, and there would be a public hearing. And there would be notice sent out to the property owners of that public hearing. This portion here was a revised preliminary plat, and we sent out notice for a Public Information Meeting, and that's generally to make residents aware that there is a preliminary plat occurring. But as -- again, as we noted, it is not a public hearing, although we do receive public input on these plans. So there is a distinction there between the hearing and the plat, and that is very specific, and there's a reason for that. So that's the reason you might receive notice for the piece to the west. For this piece, the only notice that is received by residents within 200 feet is for the PI meeting. So there is no other venue until this goes to Council. You are welcome to go to Council also and speak, but this -- this generally would be the best venue if you did have input on that specific plat.

MS. RIGGERT: Well, as I noted earlier, I appreciate that. Thank you. Because I think we are not as aware of the process as obviously you are all. The sentiments expressed this evening at our HOA meeting, which several of us just left early so that we could be sure to be here before this meeting occurred was that we would like an opportunity to talk to the developer as future development progresses so that -- because we believe as residents of the Vineyards that we share an interest with any future developer that the neighborhood be something that is really nice and high quality, and we're -- we do have a concern that the lots are making it difficult for similar homes -- homes similar to the ones that currently exist to be built. I've had -- I've spoken to a builder who said that he has -- has been struggling to come up with a design. He said one of his more recent homes was a 65-foot wide home, and that would be wider than some of the lots that are proposed on both sides of this. So we're a little bit concerned

about that. We, as neighbors -- and I can't say that we're speaking on behalf of the entire HOA or the Vineyards Association because we didn't take a vote, we just wanted to come here and speak -- would welcome an opportunity to talk with Mr. Crockett, staff and with the developers about any future plans in whatever manner might be appropriate.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, ma'am. As staff mentioned, there will be -- you know, if there's future development on that PD area, then there would be future discussion --

MS. RIGGERT: I mean, but to this too.

MR. STRODTMAN: As well as City -- if we decide to push it -- move it on to City Council, then there obviously will be opportunity there for you also, as well as anybody else from your HOA.

MS. RIGGERT: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you for coming this evening, ma'am.

MS. RIGGERT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone else like to come forward? I see none.
Commissioners, additional discussion?

MR. TOOHEY: I've got a question for Mr. Crockett. So in -- in looking at the size of the lots, the size of these lots actually do seem consistent with what's already been developed out there.

MR. CROCKETT: They are.

MR. TOOHEY: Am I missing something?

MR. CROCKETT: They are very consistent with what -- with the other lots that are in that area. You can kind of see the dashed portions there within -- relatively the same size there. I mean, they may be a little smaller in some areas, but they're -- you know, they may not be as deep, but we have green space behind a lot of our lots. A lot of the lots are even deeper. The reference to the lots on Ballentine --

MR. STRODTMAN: Is -- was there a question, Mr. --

MR. TOOHEY: Yeah. I was just curious if it was consistent because when you look at some of the stuff that has already been developed out there, there's already other -- a few of the lots that are actually smaller --

MR. STRODTMAN: Right.

MR. TOOHEY: -- then --

MR. CROCKETT: I think the lots here are fairly consistent with the existing lots in the subdivisions. Yes.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional discussion? A motion for consideration?

Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 17-100, Vineyards Preliminary Plat No. 3, revised preliminary plat, I move to approve.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: We have a motion from Mr. Stanton for approval of Case 17-100, with a second from Mr. MacMann. Commissioners, do we have additional discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

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

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Planning and Zoning's recommendation for approval of the revised preliminary plat for Vineyards, Preliminary Plat No. 3 will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.

As it relates to Case 17-100, Vineyards Preliminary Plat No. 3, revised preliminary plat, I move to approve.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Harder, Loe, Rushing, Stanton, Strodtman, Toohey and MacMann

Excused: 1 - Russell

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 17-128

A request by Columbia Civil Engineering Group, LLC (agent) on behalf of Discovery Park Apartments, LLC (owner) for a major amendment to the "Lots 4 & 5 Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 2B" PD (Planned Development) Development Plan approved on 1/27/15, to be known as "Lots 4, 5, & 5A Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 2C" PD Plan. The 17.55-acre subject property is located at the southwest corner of Nocona Parkway and Ponderosa Street. **(This item was tabled at the June 8, 2017 meeting)**

MR STRODTMAN: We'll go ahead and open our first public hearing. At this time, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 17-128, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have

the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us.

MR. STRODTMAN: 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 major amendment for the Lots 4, 501, & 502 [sic] Discovery Park Subdivision PD plan.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Commissioners, is there any questions for staff?

Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a real quick statement. Thank you all for getting the residential connection there to the south.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. I like that. If there's no additional discussion, we'll open up for a public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: This is a public hearing, so if there is anyone who would like to come forward and speak on this project, please give us your name and address, and we welcome you.

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. My name is Jay Gebhardt, a civil engineer for A Civil Group at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. Basically, I am here to answer any questions that you guys might have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Short and sweet. Commissioners, is there any questions for this speaker? We see none.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Gebhardt. Any additional speakers in the audience that would like to come forward? I see none. We'll go ahead and close that public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 17-128, I move to approve the Discovery Park Plat 2C, Lots 4, 5, 5A PD Plan.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. Mr. Stanton has made a motion for approval and has been seconded by Mr. MacMann. Is there any additional questions or clarification needed to this motion, Commissioners? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Yes. Thank you.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.

Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms.

Rushing, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. BURNS: Motion carries eight to zero.

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

As it relates to Case 17-128, I move to approve the Discovery Park Plat 2C, Lots 4, 5, 5A PD Plan.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Harder, Loe, Rushing, Stanton, Strodtman, Toohey and MacMann

Excused: 1 - Russell

Case # 17-142

A request by Allstate Consultants, LLC (agent) on behalf of the City of Columbia (owner) for a PD (Planned District) Development Plan to be known as "Columbia Indoor Sports Complex Philips Park" PD plan, which constitutes an amendment to the previously approved "A. Perry Philips Park, Phase 1" PD plan. The 139.07-acre subject property is currently zoned PD and is located at the northeast corner of Gans Road and Bristol Lake Parkway.

MR. STRODTMAN: Moving on. At this time, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 17-142, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. I see none.

MR. STRODTMAN: 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 major amendment for the Columbia Indoor Sports Complex Philips Park PD plan.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Commissioners, questions for staff?
Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Yes, Mr. Smith, were the neighbors presented with the fence option? Is that what they're expecting or were there other public hearings that were conducted? You know, will they be surprised when a fence doesn't go up?

MR. SMITH: That's a good question. We do have a representative from the Park District here. I'm not sure if she was involved in those meetings, but I was anticipating if there was comment tonight at the public hearing too, that is something that is -- is not set in stone. If a fence is more agreeable for the residents to the north, that is certainly something that can be considered. But, again, we're proposing it as an alternative that we think makes a lot of sense in this case.

MS. BURNS: And I think alternatives are great. I just think if somebody was expecting one thing and gets another --

MR. SMITH: Sure.

MS. BURNS: -- as long as it's conveyed that it might be changing and any concerns are addressed, I would be in favor of that change.

MR. SMITH: I would say I don't think the fence was added until it was under review by our staff. I think they have previous iterations -- the Park District's Public Meetings before it even got to the stage where it came to us. So I don't know for sure if they were anticipating it, but it was added later.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I'd like to follow up on Commissioner Burns' excellent point. We had discussed during the UDO procedure alternatives to screenings, so we just didn't call it a fence. Some of that was certain levels of opacity, certain levels of vegetation density at given landmarks. Is that the type of thing that you're looking for there or do we know -- I mean, I trust the arborist, I really do.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: I just -- I'm just trying to get it in the record so -- before it goes to Council and people come up and say, Why isn't there a fence --

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: -- and what works here, and that type of thing.

MR. SMITH: Yes. I think we're looking for probably something that's close to that opacity, but spread out over that 100-foot buffer area. It's probably less than 100. With the landscape area, it's probably more like 70 feet or so, so it gives them a little more space to get a little variety within that area. Right now with the 10-foot buffer, they'd -- everything would have to be compacted within that 10-foot space.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MR. SMITH: The screen -- the fence would be right at the property line. You could do, I think, a solid hedge to meet that screening requirement. Those are a little bit more maintenance heavy too, but I think we can get close to that without it being directly on the property line and have more items such as, you know, your spruces and your evergreen trees that are -- are staggered along that line that kind of still gets that same effect.

MR. MACMANN: Just for the record, I -- I agree with staff that I'm not so sure about building a park and then putting a fence around it. It's like haven't we defeated ourselves? I was just kind of wondering where we're going to go there, and there's some elements

with the arborists I'm sure we'll address. Thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: I just have a small note, but, Mr. Smith, where does -- the road, is this just a service road that services the north side of the building? And it looks like maybe there's a turnaround -- back-up, turnaround at their end. Is that kind of it or is there -- is there any intentions for connectivity to that later or is it just strictly for a trash service type situation?

MR. SMITH: I can't speak if its connectivity. I know it's required for fire code right now for access purposes. It also provides access to the -- to the garbage site as well. There are no loading facilities in the back, so it wouldn't be something that's used for any type of, you know, high -- high-use traffic -- you know, semis or anything like that. We did speak to the Park District about that, and most deliveries will come through the front of the site. But the future development of that could connect through on that. I expect that other larger facilities might also need the fire access to the rear of the buildings and it may make sense to extend this behind other buildings.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Any additional questions of staff? I see none. This is a public hearing. We'll go ahead and open it to the public.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STRODTMAN: If you would like to come forward and speak, please just come forward and give us your name and address.

MS. COFFMAN: Good evening, everyone. I'm Erika Coffman. I'm the recreation services manager for the Columbia Parks and Rec Department, so I'm here on behalf. I do -- I'm here just really basically to answer questions for you. I think he did a great job of detailing the planned idea of what we want to do with this Phase I Complex Facility. It is a sports field house to bring in basketball, volleyball, pickleball, those kind of uses, into this facility. We have worked very closely with the Odles and our surrounding neighbors to kind of meet their needs and requirements. And we definitely -- this is just kind of your comment -- we build a park, we won't -- we don't want to block people out of it. So we definitely want to work and meet the ordinance guidelines, but want to encourage people to come into that park. It is very close -- Blue Acres kind of sits between ourselves and Nifong Parks. We would want to continue just to expand those areas and connect them altogether as best as possible as those developments move forward. So I'm just here to answer any other specific questions that you might have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker?
Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I believe this program -- or this project qualifies for the 1 percent for Art Program.

MS. COFFMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MS. COFFMAN: We are actually having our first standing meeting next week, and we'll be deciding how we're going to move forward. And our architect has been involved in that in some -- beginning some discussion, but the first committee meeting is next week. And myself and two others from our staff will be involved.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. COFFMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: This building appears to have been moved to the back side of the lot as far as possible, and that has taken some regrading to achieve. So I'm just interested in what the thinking was behind that.

MS. COFFMAN: Part of that is is actually it really is kind of mis-- deceiving when you go out to that lot. We actually did bring it at that location so that once you enter the building, you will actually come into the lobby area and you will look down onto the courts. It will be about eight to ten feet difference, so you'll -- you'll be standing in the concession area in the main lobby looking down onto the courts. That would allow us additional viewing and it also will -- allowed us to bring the scale of this building down for the -- for the idea of the neighborhood and the area that it sits in the property. We took a -- a -- various [sic] of looks or a lot of hard looks at the best way to place that building on that property to be visible from Highway 63. We want to attract tournaments, and we want to attract people into Columbia with the facility, but also be cognizant of the structure itself and how it looks on the park property.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just two quick comments. Having participated in the construction of several buildings integrated into the grade, I really appreciate that because I think it looks really cool. And secondly, I want to thank your department for sending someone here because not all City departments do that.

MS. COFFMAN: Well, I appreciate it.

MR. MACMANN: And it's nice to have someone here to have questions answered. I appreciate it. Thank you.

MS. COFFMAN: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions? Ms. Coffman, could -- would you be able to address any on that road on that northern side? Is that just for fire --

MS. COFFMAN: The back entrance is for delivery purposes. Obviously, also for emergency purposes if we were to have an ambulance on the back side of the building, if

we were -- need to access that, and also for fire services. So it's mainly for public safety purposes.

MR. STRODTMAN: And any knowledge of future connectivity onto something else?

MS. COFFMAN: Well, definitely we -- we hope that this portion of the building -- this phase of the building is successful so that we can add an additional phase to this building and add additional basketball courts or another phase to that building in the future. So there was reasons that we -- that would make that connectivity as back there as it connects to that part of the building. As an additional, we want to add an additional trail system to the whole property. Currently, we just have the interior trail that is around the lake itself, so we would hope to make the whole property be connected, so some of that is coming back there, and maybe multi-using some space just to begin with.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Yes?

MR. HARDER: How many courts will there be? Do you have an --

MS. COFFMAN: We will be able to accommodate four basketball courts and five volleyball courts. One of our courts will be allowed -- so that we can do two volleyball courts on it, so if we were to have some league play or a tournament, we could do some volleyball and some basketball and still accommodate that. In addition too, we'll be able to overlay six pickleball courts on those courts, and we are recommending cross courts as well, so we would be able to have a total of eight cross courts. So we would be able to accommodate the little gals and guys that participate in our CYBA program, as well as some of our smaller basketball participants that just want to play.

MR. HARDER: Great. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Coffman, it is apparent we are definitely in need of basketball courts and volleyball courts and pickleball courts, so I hope to see a future expansion soon, and we look forward to some big tournaments coming to Columbia.

MS. COFFMAN: Well, thank you for your support.

MR. SMITH: I might ask the speaker as a representative of the applicant that she confirms she is okay with the condition on approval of the plan to amend it to remove the fence.

MS. COFFMAN: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Just for the record.

MS. COFFMAN: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MS. COFFMAN: We are on record of that, and we -- we do feel like yourself, that it's important that we have a park that's accessible to everyone, but we definitely want to meet -- you know, we will work to make sure that there is the buffering that is necessary

to be there.

MR. STRODTMAN: There will be people coming and going and lights and things, so we respect that. So thank you.

MS. COFFMAN: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Any additional speakers like to come forward this evening? I see none. We'll go ahead and close the public hearing portion.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional discussion? Comments? Questions? Motions? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 17-142, I move to approve the major amendment for the Columbia Indoor Sports Complex Philips Park PD Plan.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Wait. With the amendment regarding removing the fence.

MR. STANTON: Oh, can I just say per staff req--

MR. CALDERA: It would probably be cleaner if you guys included the amendment in the motion.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: So you're just going to say that you approve it with the amendment that the fence is removed and replaced with the appropriate augmented screening?

MR. STANTON: I accept that amendment.

MR. STRODTMAN: And, Mr. MacMann, you're okay with the --

MR. MACMANN: I second your amendment to the amendment. How about that?

MR. STRODTMAN: Sounds pretty official. We have a motion with an amendment that has been put on the floor and seconded. Commissioners, is there any additional discussion needed before we do roll call? Ms. Burns, when you are ready.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

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

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. A recommendation of -- from Planning and Zoning will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.

As it relates to Case 17-142, I move to approve the major amendment for the Columbia Indoor Sports Complex Philips Park PD Plan subject to the plan being amended to remove the fence along the site's northern boundary and replaced

with the appropriate augmented screening.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Harder, Loe, Rushing, Stanton, Strodtman, Toohey and MacMann

Excused: 1 - Russell

VII. COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC

MR. STRODTMAN: Comments of the public? Is there anyone from the public that would like to come forward?

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. My name is Jay Gebhardt. I'm a civil engineer for A Civil Group. Tonight your earlier request that wanted to be tabled and was withdrawn got me thinking. So when you have -- and I have a question for you all. When you have a proposed rezoning that typically we would do as a Planned District, because a Planned District gives you a plan, and I noticed tonight there's some confusion on your all's part of whether it would be a plan and when that would come. So that's why I'm asking this question. With a Planned District, you get a plan and also we have a statement of intent, and from my side of the table when I talk to neighbors, that gives me a lot of tools I can use to address concerns -- you know, times of operation, parking, traffic, lights, signage, all that kind of stuff can be addressed on a plan. But under the new UDC, I'm afraid if I bring a plan -- a PD, District 4, it's not looking as a favorable thing, and I am being encouraged to look at the straight zonings, which there is no plan. And so my question to you is if I bring a straight zoning to you with a conceptual drawing and saying if you approve it, this is what we will build, it doesn't carry the weight that the PD plan carried or I can request a PD with a plan and maybe suffer some criticism for using a PD when a straight zoning could have done it. And so this is a decision I have to make upfront when I make an application, and it's a decision I need to make when I talk to clients. And it's - it's kind of case dependent, you know -- are there neighbors or what -- how close are they, what type, what are we doing, and that. But I see this as kind of a conflict for me at least, and I just thought -- I wondered what you guys -- I mean, we've all been training to want to plan and see what we're voting for and what we're proposing. So now I'm -- I'm -- you know, if I ask for a PD plan, there's -- there has to be reasons to ask for it and things like that. So I don't want to get a PD plan and then be kind of discouraged from using it and then not know what to do. So what do you guys think?

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll open it in a little bit.

MR. CALDERA: Actually before -- before there's a response there -- go, sir.

MR. TEDDY: I just wanted to caution the Commissioners into making this into an additional agenda item. It is scheduled public comment, and typically you'll receive the comments. Any questions I would treat as rhetorical questions, unless it's a simple yes

or no answer. If -- if you would like, we could schedule some kind of work session topic around Mr. Gebhardt's comment. I think that would be fair, but it seems like we're prolonging the case earlier because I think Mr. Gebhardt's reacting a little bit to that unless he planned to --

MR. GEBHART: I --

MR. STRODTMAN: I think it's a good clarification, but I also see your point, and -- and -- but --

MR. TEDDY: Well, with the back and forth --

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. But I do think Mr. Gebhardt's made a good point because I was a little confused with the plan and not having a plan, and obviously, the neighbors were very confused and concerned about not having a plan. So -- but I think there's ways around that so that we could have had a different outcome maybe tonight.

MR. GEBHARDT: Yeah. Absolutely. And I'm not talking --

MR. STRODTMAN: But --

MR. GEBHARDT: -- about because of difference at all --

MR. STRODTMAN: -- that's a different situation, but I do think we might have to have some discussion later. But again, we don't want to answer questions and get into a dialogue that may be related to another case. So anything else?

MR. GEBHARDT: Yeah. If you guys want to talk to me after the meeting, I'll stick around.

MR. STRODTMAN: We'll have a chance to speak at a point too. So, thank you, Mr. Gebhardt. Any additional speakers from the public? I see none.

VIII. COMMENTS OF THE STAFF

MR. STRODTMAN: Comments of the staff?

MR. SMITH: Staff has no comments.

MR. STRODTMAN: We will go on record as the first time that staff has no comments.

MR. MACMANN: I move that we do not tell Director Zenner what just happened. Mr. Stanton, would you second that?

IX. COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

MR. STRODTMAN: Comments of Commissioners? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I do have one. How do we address A Civil Group's issue? You can -- I mean, can he write you directly in correspondence? Because that's a very good point.

MS. RUSHING: Uh-huh.

MR. CALDERA: Absolutely. I completely understand. I would actually recommend and advise that you guys actually just make that as part of your agenda for the next meeting work session -- probably work session, and you literally can open it up to anyone to come in and to discuss these issues. The -- the concern that we have is that we haven't given adequate notice for this type of dialogue to other members who might benefit from that discussion. So we have no objection to you guys actually talking to anybody and advising -- answering their questions, it just needs to be given enough notice so that everybody can participate.

MR. STRODTMAN: The process was duly noted, but it was a good point, so I would agree that we should discuss it in some format later, properly vetted. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just that. I think we should request to staff that we put on our work -- work session agenda --

MR. STRODTMAN: Duly noted.

MR. MACMANN: -- at some juncture.

MR. STRODTMAN: Duly noted.

MR. MACMANN: We've got a pretty busy work session agenda going forward.

MR. STRODTMAN: We might. We might. Additional comments, Commissioners?

MR. STRODTMAN: It looks like our next meeting date is July 6, 2017 at 7:00 pm, tentative. Is it tentative due to work load or -- I know I will be absent that evening, but I'm not for sure of a quorum.

MR. SMITH: I'm not aware of it being tentative. So I will have to look into that. But from my point of view, I think it's going to occur, so we do have things scheduled for the meeting. So if that got on the agenda inadvertently, I apologize.

MR. STRODTMAN: Maybe it's just on mine that I printed earlier, and it's not on the official. So with that -- really, I have one last thing before I take a motion for adjournment. It's kind of related to the basketball courts. I would just like to thank the City of Columbia, University of Missouri, the business community for MSHAA recently announced the music festival will stay in Columbia for five more years. So these events -- these basketball courts, they are huge for our economic ability for Columbia, so I thank the City and Parks & Rec for doing the basketball courts because I think it will be highly demanded and we look forward to additional courts for our future.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE - July 6, 2017 @ 7pm (tentative)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MR. STRODTMAN: So with that, anything else, Commissioners, except the motion

for adjournment?

MS. LOE: Move to adjourn.

MR. STRODTMAN: Move to adjourn. Do we have a --

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- second from Mr. Stanton. All in favor, thumbs up. Everybody is in favor of adjournment. Adjourned.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. STRODTMAN: Have a nice evening, everyone.

(The meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.)

(Off the record)

Move to adjourn

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-7214. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.