



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Thursday, September 20, 2018  
7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Council Chambers  
Columbia City Hall  
701 E. Broadway

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. STRODTMAN: Good evening, everyone. I'd like to welcome everyone to the City of Columbia Thursday, September 20th, Planning and Zoning Commission regular meeting.

MR. STRODTMAN: May I have a roll call, please.

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

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

**Present:** 8 - Tootie Burns, Dan Harder, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Lee Russell, Anthony Stanton, Rusty Strodtman and Michael MacMann

**Excused:** 1 - Brian Toohey

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

#### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Zenner, is there any changes to our agenda this evening?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, sir.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir.

#### IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

August 23 and September 6, 2018

MR. STRODTMAN: We have two sets of minutes this evening to discuss, August 23, 2018 regular meeting minutes is the first one. Are there any corrections or notations needed to those minutes? If not, I will take a thumbs up for the August 23rd notes?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. STRODTMAN: And that's unanimous for the ones that were here. We have a second set of minutes from our September 6, 2018 regular meeting. Are there any changes or corrections needed to those notes? I see none. I'll take a thumbs up for the ones that were here that evening.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. STRODTMAN: And that is unanimous for the September 6 minutes.

**Thumbs Up approval of August 23rd 2018 and September 6th 2018 meeting minutes**

#### V. TABLING REQUESTS

**Case #18-166**

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Gary Ridenhour (owner), to have 64.32 acres permanently zoned R-1 (One-family Dwelling), 2.29 acres permanently zoned M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood), and 2.38 acres permanently zoned M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor) subject to annexation into the City of Columbia. The subject site contains a total of 68.98 acres and is presently zoned County A-2 (Agriculture). The site is generally located east of Masonic Drive, west of Alfalfa Drive & Oakland Gravel Road, and north of Prathersville Road.

MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a short staff report for the tabling request? Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, you may, Mr. Chairman. As indicated, this particular parcel contains 68.98 acres. This is a permanent zoning request subject to annexation considerations by City Council. We're looking at three different zoning classifications. The bulk of the property is for residential use with a portion of the property at the corner of Oakland Gravel and Prathersville for M-C and then the interior portion of the property along Masonic Drive for the M-N zoning designation. The applicant has presented a request to table in order to allow for they and the City staff to develop a development agreement. We met earlier today as it related to the terms of that development agreement and believe that we will be able to complete the necessary paperwork by which to have the roughed draft of that agreement completed by the October 4th meeting. Minor additional review is still being conducted by the City staff on a corresponding preliminary plat that goes with this which does not require public notice and, therefore, is not being requested to be tabled at this time, as well as to address issues with the zoning, which is Case Number 18-166. The applicant is here this evening if you -- or the applicant's representative, I should say, is here this evening if you do have questions. And as you will notice, there are a number of people here in the audience this evening that I believe are the affected adjacent property owners in the Willowbrook Subdivision, which immediately to the east on Alfalfa and then the Haystack Acres and Haystack Acres Addition developments to the north and east. And with that, that is all we have to offer. We are supportive of the request to allow us to complete the necessary paperwork for that development agreement and ensure that we have the details associated with the property locked down in order to be able to come back with a full recommendation to the Commission on both the preliminary plat and the permanent zoning.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Commissioners, any questions for staff on this tabling request report? I see none. As is in past practices, this is not a public hearing, but I will -- we will allow public input this evening. But I want to clarify what we're

looking for right at this point, this is a tabling request. We're not looking right at this point for public discussion on the actual case. It's on the actual tabling request. So if you have some reason why you think we should not table it, that's what we would like to discuss tonight. If you want to discuss why we should not approve this case, that's not what we want to discuss right now. So does that help everybody? My assumption is you're probably here to discuss the case more than the actual tabling, so the applicant and the City are asking for some more time is basically what they're doing, is they're asking for some more time to work through some issues or some matters that they have not been able to get together at this point. So if we, as a Commission, decide to table this to October 4th, then on October 4th, we would ask for everyone to come forward -- or some of you to come forward, whoever would like to come forward to speak to us on that particular case, why we should approve it or why we should not approve the case at that time. So hopefully that makes sense. Now if for some reason we decide not to table it this evening, we could hear the case, but most times, in my experience of eight years, we typically table it the first time to give everybody a chance to work through maybe some issues that maybe came to light later in the process or they just had -- took more time than necessary, and we try to get both sides to come together before it comes to us, and that's usually what a tabling request is about. So with that I will open it up to anybody that would like to come forward, speak to us on the tabling request for this evening. You don't have to if you don't want to, but if you would like to, this is the time. If not -- and if you do come forward, we would ask for your name and address.

MR. GEBHARDT: My name is Jay Gebhardt; I'm a civil engineer for A Civil Group here in Columbia, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court, here to answer questions of why we're tabling it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just one real quick. Are you guys confident -- hi, Mr. Gebhardt. Are you as confident as staff as in -- that October 4th is a no-later-than date that you all can meet?

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes. We had a very productive meeting today, so I think that we'll --

MR. MACMANN: All right. Because I think we've got a lot of folks here that would want to discuss that, and I just want to make sure we're going to not have them traipse out here too often.

MR. GEBHARDT: And also we're -- we're in communication with the neighbors and we have a good line of communication back and forth. As soon as we have these amendments figured out, we'll -- we'll get to the neighbors too so that they know what's

going on and what we've agreed to and stuff.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Gebhardt.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: And, Mr. Gebhardt, you're thinking that it's going to be before October 4th that the -- the neighbors would know what --

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- what you have worked out?

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Thank you, sir.

MR. GEBHARDT: It will be in a draft form. It won't be a signed document, but we'll -- we'll have hammered out the details.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Any additional questions, Commissioners? None. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Gebhardt. Anyone else like to come forward?

MS. BOOKER: Hello, everybody. My name is Margaret Booker, and I live at 6395 North Oakland Gravel Road on the farm that's mid picture, so it's a big open area just beyond Willowbrook. And the farm would be -- and that piece that the arrow is on just a second ago would most likely be annexed if this goes forward to fruition. I'm concerned about the tabling. I got good preliminary information from Mr. Gebhardt, but I don't yet have a full picture of what this request was. So I'm very interested to see this draft, at which point I'll have a better picture of how we move forward. So I'm neither here nor there in terms of tabling or going forward, but I am anxious to see what this agreement contains and to be back in front of you on the 4th. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, ma'am. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you. Anyone else like to come forward? We're good. Commissioners, any further discussion or discussion on this -- Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I've got a motion.

MR. STRODTMAN: I would love a motion.

MS. RUSSELL: In the case of 18-166, I move to table the item until the October 4th Commission meeting.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Ms. Russell has made a motion for Case 18-166 to table to October 4th. It has received its proper second from Mr. MacMann. Is there any discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready for a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes. Thank you.

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

**Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell,**

**Ms. Burns. Motion carries 8-0.**

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. It will be tabled to October 4th, and we would ask everybody to come back if you can. If you're not able to come back, you're always welcome to send comments to City staff -- Mr. Zenner, and he will make sure that we get those, he always does. So if you can't attend, we understand, but send your comments because we do want to hear them. So thank you. And with that, we'll move on to our next case. And you're welcome to leave if you guys want, or you're welcome to stay. We always like the company. We'll give you guys a second to get out.

**In the case of 18-166, move to table the item until the October 4th Commission meeting is approved.**

**Yes:** 8 - Burns, Harder, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Strodman and MacMann

**Excused:** 1 - Toohey

**VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS****Case # 18-173**

A request by Lueck Surveying (agent), on behalf of Melissa M. Williams (owner), to rezone 0.2 acres from R-1 (One-family Residential) to M-OF (Mixed-use Office). The subject property is located on the south side of Heriford Road southeast of the terminus of Burlington Street and addressed as 1804 Heriford Road.

MR. STRODTMAN: Moving on to our first public hearing of the evening.

MR. STRODTMAN: 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 request to rezone the property M-OF (Mixed-Use Office).

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Appreciate the staff report. Commissioners, questions of staff? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Were there any public comments? You mentioned how many cards were sent out, but --

MR. PALMER: There were, I believe, two phone calls and they were more questions than comments, and it was just, you know, what's happening and just informational, and there were no substantive comments.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Palmer, just a context question. I'm glad you mentioned the Honda R-1 property. Is -- the way I understand the bio-retention center, that cannot be developed; is that a correct statement?

MR. PALMER: I believe unless the entire property were redeveloped, that's true.

MR. MACMANN: All right. And then the second question is also a context question. We have that wedge, as you called it, that sliver of I-G property back there. Is that really three separate I-G lots; is that what that is?

MR. PALMER: Yes. I believe that's true.

MR. MACMANN: And that doesn't look like -- well, two of them don't look like they have the size to be anything, but -

MR. PALMER: No.

MR. MACMANN: I just wondered about -- for future context here.

MR. PALMER: I believe, like I said, they were -- they were what was left of lots that got almost completely consumed by the road right-of-way for I-70, and they're under separate ownership and everything, so yeah.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PALMER: An odd situation.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Palmer, I've got a couple of questions. How -- how do we handle parking? Did we look at number of stalls in this -- I drove through there and it's not really a parking -- I mean, it's gravel.

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: It's a driveway.

MR. PALMER: We have discussed that at the concept review meaning, and I honestly don't remember what we discussed. But I know that there's -- there is room there for at least two cars, if not three, and I know that the size of the -- of the home or the office is going to be limiting in the number of folks that can be there at one time anyway. So you'll probably see the -- the counselor there and then also maybe a short overlap of patients as they come and go, but it should probably never be more than three people there at any one time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Kind of in that same vein, what about lighting? Do we -- do we hold this to the same standard that we would other M-OF zoning and mandate lighting standards of some type?

MR. PALMER: I don't believe lighting was discussed.

MR. ZENNER: Lighting would not be. We'd have signage restrictions as it relates to it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Can you keep -- that was one of my questions, too. What is that? There's no signage or -

MR. ZENNER: In the M-OF district, yes. We do have signage requirements and hold on here, I'll get to those. I was trying to get to the parking first, but let's handle lighting. As part of the neighborhood protection standards, if any lighting were to be placed on this property, it would have to be reduced because the adjacent properties are both R-1. That does require that light heights go down to a minimum of -- a maximum of 20 feet for neighborhood protection. Again there is nothing that mandates any type of security lighting or anything else, so the lighting issue is not going to come into play. And then as it relates to signage, that is going to be driven by business sign -- business use signs outside of our M-DT -- that's the wrong one. Hold on here. In the M-OF district on a collector or nonresidential street, which is, I believe, what Heriford would probably be classified as, maximum of a ten-foot-tall sign, freestanding sign. It would have to be permitted. Must -- must be located ten feet off of the public right-of-way. You'll notice this does not have a sidewalk on it. It would not be required to put a sidewalk in unless the parcel were redeveloped, hence the support that staff has for it, the characteristics of

this property are going to be still unnoticeable as an office use. A ten-foot monument-style sign that would be a maximum of 48 square foot would probably be overkill for this small home. It does have the opportunity for wall signage and our wall signage standards within the M-OF district for the same road class, local nonresidential, would be a maximum of 48 total square feet. So, I mean, that's an eight-by-six sign, which would be pretty significant based on the size of the structure.

MR. STRODTMAN: And if any of those items were going -- it sounds like right now the applicant is not interested in doing any of those items, but I'm just thinking long term. If -- if the lighting was -- you know, someone wanted to increase the lighting or the signage to, you know, ten-foot pole or the wall pack, would they come back through the City to get some type of permitting so that we could protect that resident that's next to them?

MR. ZENNER: The signage and the lighting which would -- the signage would require a sign permit to be issued, so yes, we would review that.

MR. STRODTMAN: We would.

MR. ZENNER: Lighting would likely require some type of electrical permit if it was a freestanding pole light. If it was a wall pack, which wall packs are, if I'm not incorrect, prohibited within our Code, we wouldn't allow that, unless it was a security light for a residential property.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right.

MR. ZENNER: This is no longer going to be in that zone classification to where a farm shed light or some type of barn light-type scenario, this isn't -- it doesn't fall into that category anymore if it is rezoned. So we do have commercial -- commercial and office general design requirements that would potentially be applied to anything that would be modified on the structure. The applicant is here, as well as their agent. I would imagine they can answer very specifically what their intent is.

MR. STRODTMAN: You know, and I believe -- I agree with the staff report that, you know, I plan on supporting it. I think that, you know, long term, that at least those three residents on the south side of Heriford -- I probably was incorrectly saying it earlier -- will be something besides residential and long term probably because it's not probably ideal, but, you know, that house right next door is R-1, so I feel like we need to protect that residence because they are a resident and they think they have a residence next door that's -- you know. And I could see some value of some signage to I-70, and might take advantage of, you know, putting some signs there if I -- if I owned it as a business. And lastly, trash. Is there any differences in trash or is that just the bag out at the curb?

MR. ZENNER: Likely, it would be bag at the curb, same type of trash collection that



currently exists.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Okay. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for doing some follow up. Speaking in the future, how -- this lot is 8,000 square feet, something like that. How big of a building could they, if they were to receive their M-OF, and say in ten years they want to develop it into a larger M-OF facility, how large could that building be?

MR. PALMER: So the first impact to that property when they redevelop would be right-of-way dedication, and it would match the right-of-way on the -- to the west there. So that's going to be a significant drop --

MR. MACMANN: They're going to lose 500 feet anyway?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. And so that, of course, would further limit the size of -- of an office building there. And so I would --

MR. MACMANN: And the setbacks change because of R-1. We'll assume it's going to be R-1 20 years in the future.

MR. PALMER: And your R-1 -- you're adjacent to R-1 still, so those impacts would have to be mitigated through the area protection standards. So you're looking at a very small office building, I think.

MR. MACMANN: So potentially -- I'm trying to remember here. Mr. Zenner, I'm sure, will help me. The building could be 36 feet tall and maybe 30 by 30, 40 by 40, something like that?

MR. ZENNER: Not unless -- it could be. It could be 35 feet fall in the M-OF. You'd have to set -- at that point, you would have to either step the building down within 25 feet of the property line so your adjoining R-1 was no higher than the adjoining R-1 property line. Add a new structure greater than 24 feet, and increase your setback --

MR. MACMANN: Twenty-four, then twenty-five --

MR. ZENNER: -- or increase your side-yard setback from the residential use by an additional ten feet, which would mean you would have, I believe, a 25-foot side-yard setback on the east side of this property further shifting the building -- any future building to the west. The likelihood and I would -- I would stand to agree with Mr. Palmer, the likelihood of this building in and of itself being torn down and redeveloped into something more intense is remote to almost nonexistent. You have parking, storm-water, platting, none of which would be able to be accommodated, plus the structure. The remaining two lots possibly to the east and the property that's zoned I-G would probably need to be merged to create something that was more substantive.

MR. MACMANN: More economically viable. I'm just -- I'm thinking for -- I'm glad the Chairman brought that up, thinking about these neighborhoods. I travel through this area

somewhat, and while I may agree with the long-term analysis, I -- I just want to take into consideration that we're not creating the conditions to drive the neighbors out.

MR. STRODTMAN: I one hundred percent agree, Mr. MacMann. Any additional questions, Commissioners? If not, we'll open this up to public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STRODTMAN: If you would like to come forward and give us name and address, we would welcome you.

MR. LUECK: Members of the Commission, I'm Ron Lueck; I'm the land surveyor for this request for rezoning, offices at 914 North College here in Columbia. The -- well, Mr. Palmer stole most of my thunder there. He's given you guys a preview of everything that's going on with the place there. You know the zoning across the road is still R-1. There's six lots remaining out of this 1956 subdivision that are residences. The one directly across the street is a rental. The one to the east is a rental, and northeast, at the corner of Burlington and Heriford is a rental. Three rentals, there's three owners of which my client, Ms. Carter -- or Williams is one of the owners. She bought this in 19 -- or in 2007, lived there for four years. And as a counselor, she's looking at having this for her office. About the most signage that she is proposing would be a plaque on the garage or on the side of the door as you enter the place. And as far as lighting, there is no intention of -- at this time of any sort of exterior lighting other than what's there right now from street lighting. Her office hours are to be over by 6:00 p.m., so, you know, evening lighting is not really a desired change to the property. The driveway will accommodate two cars, and if she has two people there at one time or two vehicles traveling there at one time, they'll -- one would have to wait until the counseling with one couple is finished. And as far as anything else, staff has pretty well covered it. If you've got any questions, I will be happy to entertain them, see if I can answer you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lueck. Commissioners, do you have any questions for this speaker? Real quick, Mr. Lueck, will there be weekend hours -- Saturday?

MR. LUECK: Not at this time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lueck. Appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. LUECK: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone else like to come forward? I see none. We'll go ahead and close the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, discussion, additional questions of staff, a motion?

Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a motion if we are at that point.

MR. STRODTMAN: I think we are.

MR. MACMANN: In the matter of Case 18-173, rezone from R-1 to M-OF zoning, I move that we approve.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. We have received a motion to approve Case 18-173 by Mr. MacMann. It has received its proper second from Ms. Rushing. Do we have any discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready for a roll call, please?

MS. BURNS: Yes. Thank you.

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

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Our recommendation for approval of Case 18-173 will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration. Thank you all.

**In the matter of Case 18-173, move to approve the rezone from R-1 to M-OF zoning is approved.**

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

**Excused:** 1 - Toohey

**Case # 18-175**

A request by Simon & Struempf Engineering (agent), on behalf of MBS Realty Partners, LP (owners), requesting a major amendment to the existing "MBS O-P Plan" and approval of a new PD Plan to be known as "Boone County Family Resources PD Plan". The applicant is also seeking design exceptions from Section 29-4.4(f) and Section 29-4.6(c)(1) of the UDC pertaining to parking lot landscaping and entry door placement, respectively. The 2.44 acre site is located on the south side of West Ash Street between Heather Lane and Fairview Road and is addressed as 2700 West Ash Street.

MR. STRODTMAN: 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 major PD Plan amendment subject to:

(1) Reducing the size of the proposed parking spaces to 8.5' x 18' and increasing the width of the parking lot island to increase overall interior parking lot landscaping.

(2) Granting the design exception to Section 29-4.6(c)(1).

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. I forgot to do this earlier, but at this time, I would ask any Commissioner who has had an ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to this Case 18-175, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information in front of us. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Are there any questions for staff? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: Are there any tree preservation requirements on this property? It's totally covered with trees right now.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Yeah. So the same tree preservation area has been maintained here and actually the building is -- is pushed almost right up to it, but that was --

MS. RUSHING: So that whole west end is --

MR. PALMER: Correct. And actually the original plan depicted the area as .33 acres, I believe, which was what was required, but their area that they denoted on the plan was a little bit larger. So I think that this is -- is technically a little smaller on the plan, but it is what was required and is required now by the UDC. It's the 25 percent.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Palmer, you mentioned a five-foot height. I didn't pick up on that in your report to us, and I'm not seeing it in the final recommendation, so I'm just -- I'm curious.

MR. PALMER: It was -- I think it was glossed over a little bit in the report, but -- so the original plan which you probably can't read in the middle of the building here says height less than 45 feet. And then on this one, he just changed it to 50. Again it's -- the site has pretty extreme grading that they'll have to contend with, and Mr. Simon is here to explain a little bit better, but I think that that's the major concern is just that how we measure the height of the building and where he'll have to locate it based on the grading may dictate that it be slightly higher than 45 feet, so he -- he was hoping to get a little bit of leeway in that.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This structure will be how many stories?

MR. PALMER: It is two stories with a basement, I believe.

MR. MACMANN: All right. And where will the bio-retention facility --

MR. PALMER: It will be --

MR. MACMANN: It's undergrounded?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. It's undergrounded and it's the -- there's a dash-line here under the parking lot that will replace the open space area that was north of the building on the previous plan.

MR. MACMANN: In the future, just a request. I would love to have -- I understand we don't right now and Planner Smith is not here, but the community feedback.

MR. PALMER: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? Mr. Palmer, just for clarification, you mentioned we'll be closer to 8 percent of parking lot landscaping with the reduction?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. And I believe Mr. Simon is prepared to explain that a little more in-depth. But basically as part of our review and -- and kind of last minute, hence it wasn't on the plan, we -- we determined or discovered that the parking stalls were deeper than they needed to be. And so we were ready to move forward with it as is and -- and go with the six-foot strip and make a recommendation based on that. However, we saw -- we noticed that there is that extra half foot on each of those lanes of parking or rows of parking. And so kind of discovered that that's an additional two feet available there that -- that doesn't need to be encumbered by parking spaces and impervious area. So that would allow two feet of additional landscape strip down the center of the parking lot. And again, it's ten feet as required and a total of 10 percent of your impervious area, and so he would be at eight feet. And it's strange how it's worked out, but it would be roughly 8 percent of his impervious area.

MR. STRODTMAN: That was my clarification, because I saw eight foot once and then I saw the 8 percent, so I was just making sure I wasn't mistaken.

MR. PALMER: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: And then the property owner directly to the south is the church, the farm ground or the garden ground, I guess?

MR. PALMER: That's correct, yeah. Yeah. They own the entire parcel to the south.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Thank you. Any additional questions? I see none. We'll go ahead and open this to a public hearing. We just ask that you give us your name and address, and we welcome you to come forward.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. SIMON: Keenan Simon, 210 Park Avenue. I'm the applicant agent. We can do this one of two ways. I can kind of give you my presentation or I can answer some of the questions that you have straight off. What would you like? I'll just start with my -- I guess my presentation. All right. So this is the site that we just talked about. Just to kind of give you guys and bring you up to speed, we had a neighborhood meeting on

September 11th that included -- there were invites passed out to all the neighbors. We mainly only had people attend from the Off Broadway Condominiums and Broadway Christian Church. We also supplied the City at late notice support letters from both of those -- both the director for the Off Broadway Condominiums and the Broadway Christian Church, and I can pass those out to you if you'd like to take a look at them, as well, but they're both in support of this development. So what I'd like to do is, I guess, kind of give you a little bit of history of the site so you have the background of kind of what we're dealing with and the challenges we have. The original PD plan for this site was actually just a parking lot in 2010. And really what drove the size of this lot or parcel was essentially the developer saying I want to buy the least amount of property and still be able to meet my development needs. So back then, prior to the new UDC, there was zoning code that allowed you to not have interior landscaping, which you can see from this -- from the first PD plan approval in 2010, that there's no interior landscaping and that the two rows of parking are stacked, and there's not a lot of space to the north or the south really to provide for a grading transition and there's quite a bit of fall across the site. Fast forward to 2015, MBS came back and decided they wanted to have an office building there with a parking lot, so they reduced the parking lot size, added the office building, that brings us to this plan, which Rusty showed you previously with the detention being to the north of the building, footprint being slightly smaller, and then the parking lot on the east side. Which brings us to tonight where we're revising that 2015 PD plan to fit the needs for Boone County Family Resources. Really, what we're looking for with them is an increase in the square footage of the building, and then also an increase in parking, and this is really to support their ten-year growth plan. Here's the PD plan that was submitted. Where we came to get what we needed for their parking, currently on their site downtown, they have 95 stalls. At their facility, they have about 85 employees and then they currently have five to ten stalls that they kind of keep open for client visits. Moving forward with their projected growth, they're going to be needing over 150 stalls. Really what this comes down to is the amount of growth they've had with employees, adding additional services for the people in the community. Their ten-year, I guess, growth projections would be an increase to about 142 employees with the -- 142 employees. They also would probably need ten to fifteen stalls for client business, which kind of puts us right in that range of what we have shown on the PD plan. In regards to the interior landscaping to the parking lot, we -- we support the City's, I guess, in revising the stall depth to 18 feet. That does gain us an additional two feet to maximize that interior landscaping strip. With this revision, the interior landscaping would then be about 8 percent, like Rusty said. We feel like this does show the -- or it does -- it is a good

compromise and meets the intent of the UDC. Really, the problem we have from a civil standpoint is across the site, I had about 13 foot of fall. On a typical parking lot, you really only want 4 or 5 percent fall, which gives you about three to four feet across one stacked section of parking. So in the real world, it would be nice to only have less than ten foot of fall across this whole property when, in actuality, we have about 14 which every foot we give to provide to that interior landscaping is either more, I guess, retaining wall that we would have to do or some other type of, I guess, design practice that would be expensive for Boone County Family Resources to make it work. So we feel like this is a good fit with what we were given and what the lot was set at back in the day whenever there wasn't an interior -- I guess, interior landscaping required prior to the UDC. Really, I just want to thank you for your time and we hope you can come out in support of Boone County Family Resources. If you have any questions, let me know.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Simon. Commissioners, any questions of this speaker?

Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Simon, good evening. Will you talk to me about that bio-retention facility a little bit? And before we go there, has there been a subsoil survey done in that approximate location?

MR. SIMON: Yes. And we have had a geotechnical report done. Really what we're looking at doing would be an ADS water quality unit with the vaulted cells that --

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MR. SIMON: It's not a bio-retention cell. It's a -- it's a little bit different way of treating the water. Based off the storm-water manual, we feel like we can hit all those level of services for storm-water quality and detention with this system. It's a little bit more of an expensive system, but to meet their needs for the site, the cost is worth --

MR. MACMANN: All right. I was concerned -- I have been concerned because I am somewhat familiar with the property and -- and the flow, and that's a lot of open space for so much fall and keeping the water on site --

MR. SIMON: I'm aware of that.

MR. MACMANN: I'm sure it was a challenge -- has been a challenge for you.

MR. SIMON: Yeah. No. We've -- we've took some preliminary grading stabs at this and we have some concepts that we feel like we can make work, but there is some challenges. You are correct.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. And can you talk to me about the height that -- Commissioner Loe, did you want to address some specific issues about height? All right. But you feel that five feet is going to get you where you need to?

MR. SIMON: We feel like we'll be below the 45. The five feet is a little bit of a cushion for us. So essentially the way that the height of a structure is defined is four point outside the corner of building of what the grades are when they're averaged to the height. Depending what we do with retaining wall and stepping down to the basement, that's where we were a little bit unsure of how that definition actually plays into what we'll need, if that makes sense.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: So what would the height be from the top -- from the garage -- or the parking lot level?

MR. SIMON: So from the I guess we'll call it the first level where you enter, there would only be two stories visible.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. SIMON: Okay. And the floor -- floor heights are somewhere in the 13 to 14 feet range, is my understanding.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? I see none. Thank you,  
Mr. Simon.

MR. SIMON: Thank you.

MS. KAUFMAN: Good evening. I'm Robyn Kaufman; I'm the executive director at Boone County Family Resources, and our address is 1209 East Walnut Street, Columbia downtown. And thank you again for considering our request. Just in case you don't know, Boone County Family Resources, we serve about 1,800 persons with developmental disabilities of all ages from babies to senior citizens. We provide a number of services like employment services, helping people get a job. We do training to help people live more independently in the community. We provide support coordination, purchase a number of other services, and provide residential services, as well. And I brought some annual reports just in case you want to learn a little bit more about us. Last year, we had 9 percent growth in the number of persons we served, and we've been experiencing growth every year, so we are, you know, needing to hire the staff to provide, you know, service coordination and other services to those individuals. We've been planning for this for some time and know that we've had this need for more space. Right now in our current office building, we have 57 offices and we have, as Keenan said, 85 to 90 staff there, so we have some people in the hallway with partitions, two people in single offices, and that kind of thing to try to make do until we can get our new office space. Parking is also an issue where we're at now. There's not enough parking places for our



staff that are there and sometimes we have meetings and things like that. Don't have enough space. Plus there's a lot of students that park in our lot, as well. But anyway, we really are in need of more parking, too. We have some meeting rooms in our current building and we're really excited about the plans for our new office where we have -- we'll have a large community room. We don't have a place now for all of our 135 staff to meet together for meetings or training, and so this will afford that, but also we allow community groups, like People First and some other community groups, to use our meeting space, so this will help provide for that, too. I do have copies of the support letters from Broadway Christian Church and from Off Broadway that I can bring up to you. And, you know, I just wanted to say that Broadway Christian Church is very supportive, and we've been partnered with them on a number of different projects. They host our Cookies for -- Cookies with Santa for little kids that we support every year, and we've also already started talking to them about how we can maybe partner together to make their accessible gardens a little bit more accessible for folks with disabilities. So anyway I think that's pretty much all I was going to say, unless you have any other questions for me.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Kaufman. Commissioners, do you have any questions for this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, sir. Just one quick question. Your current facility, do you plan to still utilize that or are you going to sell it, or what are you guys going to do?

MS. KAUFMAN: We will not use it, but that would be a Board decision, but they have asked me to seek an appraisal and so we are certainly considering selling it to help pay for the cost.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you. Oh, in fairness, you are my neighbor.

MS. KAUFMAN: Oh, okay.

MR. MACMANN: So just so everyone knows that.

MS. KAUFMAN: Oh, okay. Well, good.

MR. STRODTMAN: She didn't know that.

MS. KAUFMAN: We love being downtown and really looked at options there, but it was just so much more costly.

MR. MACMANN: Much more expensive. Yes, I understand.

MR. STRODTMAN: I've just got a couple questions, Ms. Kaufman. Help me. Evidently, most of your clients are served by your employees leaving, so you go to them more than them coming to you if you only need ten more stalls; is that correct -- or is it --

MS. KAUFMAN: That is correct. You know, and that's an estimate. It just depends, because we do have staff out visiting clients during the day. We have open

spaces for people that might come for a meeting. But we do provide some training. We have some classes on budgeting and getting a job and living in your first apartment and healthy lifestyles and things like that that we do have where there's small groups that come to our site. But for the most part, you're right, the services are out in the community.

MR. STRODTMAN: So you're comfortable that the parking will be -- accommodate your -- your current needs as well as future and as well as your clients that do come to your property?

MS. KAUFMAN: Yeah. I think -- I think it should meet our current needs and future.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Thank you. Any additional questions, Commissioners? I see none. Thank you, Ms. Kaufman.

MS. KAUFMAN: I have these letters of support from --

MS. STRODTMAN: You're welcome -- we can pass them around if you -- if you just hand them to Ms. Rushing there, make it easier, we can pass them down. Thank you. Anyone else like to come forward this evening? If not, we'll go ahead and close this public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, we can wait till the paperwork comes down, but I think we are confident we know what the paperwork is. Any discussion, additional items needed from staff?

MR. MACMANN: I have a question for the chair and perhaps for legal.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: As I understand it, we have requests by the client for design exceptions listed, and we have -- I'm forming -- asking for help to form motions, and we have perhaps best practice as determined by staff and apparently seconded by the Simons, whichever direction we go, and we may need some clarity. Are we -- are you with me?

MR. PALMER: For your motion?

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. Whatever the motion may be, if that's some in-between motion or --

MR. ZENNER: Well, we'll as usual, but we'll give you the -- we'll give you the language.

MR. PALMER: If you would like to follow our recommendation, which is at the -- well, there are -- it's laid out there in this --

MR. MACMANN: One of the reasons I mention this is because this -- there are four or five. Depending on how we do this, there could be several tweaks, design adjustments

type thing. All right.

MR. STRODTMAN: So, Mr. MacMann, are you going to make a motion?

MR. MACMANN: Yes. Can we go back to the page with the design exceptions on it so I can --

MR. PALMER: Well, this one -- this one has everything but the height, for some reason.

MR. MACMANN: That's why Lee is here.

MS. LOE: Does the -- does the height need to be itemized?

MS. RUSSELL: Is that the design section?

MR. PALMER: It would be -- it is on the plan.

MS. LOE: No. That was the door.

MR. PALMER: So if you approve the plan, you defecto approve the height --

MR. MACMANN: My motion would sound something like this: 18-175, per design adjustment, and if we were to adopt staff's suggestions, that would have to be an amendment, would it not?

MR. STRODTMAN: Huh-uh.

MS. RUSSELL: No. You can just make that.

MR. PALMER: Just make the motion based on whatever parts of it you like.

MR. MACMANN: I believe Commissioner Russell feels very confident in making this motion. I think I'm going to pass that baton to her.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Russell, would you like to try?

MS. RUSSELL: Sure. In regards to Case 18-175, I move to approve the major PD plan amendment subject to reducing the parking spaces to 8.5 feet times 18 feet, increasing the width of the internal landscape strip to eight feet, granting the design exception to Section 29-4.6(c)(1), and granting the five-foot height extension on the building.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Unfortunately, we are not able to take any discussion from the crowd. So, could we -- Commissioners, we have -- a motion has been made by Ms. -- Commissioner Russell to approve Case 18-175, and has it has received its property second from Mr. Stanton. Is there any discussions needed on that motion? I see none. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Can I offer amendment if we discuss it? No? Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: We'll either pass this one and then you'll -

MR. STANTON: Never mind.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Burns, when you're ready for a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

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

**8-0.**

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Our recommendation for Case 18-175 for approval will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration. That is all of our cases for this evening.

**In regards to Case 18-175, move to approve the major PD plan amendment subject to reducing the parking spaces to 8.5 feet times 18 feet, increasing the width of the internal landscape strip to eight feet, granting the design exception to Section 29-4.6(c)(1), and granting the five-foot height extension on the building.**

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

**Excused:** 1 - Toohey

**VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

MR. STRODTMAN: Is there anyone from the public that would like to come forward this evening and give us any comments?

**VIII. STAFF COMMENTS**

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Zenner, would like to give us some comments?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. Your next meeting will be on October 18th -- October 18th? I apologize. October 4th. You do not get an extra week off. If you haven't noticed, you have a -- you have a new PowerPoint presentation in front of you this evening. And in my zealouslyness in preparing it for tonight, I was a week -- two weeks in advance, but you have a meeting on the 4th of October and there are a number of items on that agenda, one of which we moved on this evening. So your upcoming cases for October 4th are such. You have a subdivision design modification for a sidewalk. This is Victory Church up off of Ballenger, Route PP, about our east side of town, a request for a design modification again for the requirement to install sidewalk along Ballenger Road as it relates to the construction of a new church, which is constructed at this point and waiting to be issued a full CO, if I understand correctly, subject to this design modification on the sidewalk. It is roughly, if I'm not incorrect, about a half mile worth of sidewalk on their frontage. There are some issues that we will raise with you as it relates to the sidewalk. This is also a segment of Ballenger Lane that is being upgraded to have to the pedway on either side, the pedestrian pavement expansions adjacent to the roadway, but we will have more information for you on the 4th with that. Then we have a number of public hearings. Discovery Park South PD, a major plan revision and an approval of a new plan.

This is a case that has been tabled several times and is now coming off of its tabling and is intended to be discussed. This is a property that is south of the Discovery-Gans Road interchange. It would be the extension of Endeavor Drive, which is just off of the interchange to the west of Ponderosa. The western -- the eastern boundary of the subject tract actually is Ponderosa south of the interchange location. Cullimore Cottages, a name, I imagine, that has been designated in honor of Dan Cullimore, one of our community activists that passed away earlier this year. This is a City project. This is going to be our second cottage project similar to what we have built off of Lynn Street, a little bit larger. It is proposed to be a planned zone with a development plan, and that will be discussed in greater detail, as well. I imagine we will have Mr. Cole here from our CDBG Division to provide a little bit of background on how the project may operate, as well as we will have the engineer, which is Crockett Engineering, representing University Chrysler Subaru. This is another PD plan major amendment. This particular project has resulted due to the removal of a required screening buffer to upgrade the original buffer that was there because it was dilapidated and falling down, and the applicant desires to make modifications to a 1972 C-P plan that was approved that specified that that screening be provided ten feet off of their property line to the north closer to the existing parking lot of the dealership. They are proposing to move it back and put landscaping back in more in accordance with their current UDC requirements, which would be on the inside of the fence, not the outside. Again, we'll do a little bit more detail with that for you. That one may also have some additional public comment provided as a result of a controversy that has existed -- a longstanding controversy between the adjacent residential development and the commercial development to the -- to the north. And then our tabled items, which is a combined action public hearing and our subdivision for the Ridenhour permanent zoning request. And then Oakland Crossing Plat Number 1. That is the single-family development I spoke of today which would have the two out parcel lots to it that were the M-N and the M-C parcels. Just to familiarize yourself with the locations, Victory Christian Church, as you can see, that very long, lengthy frontage that they have, and then the area that is lighter colored here where the pointer is, that is the actual church. This aerial did not show it as being constructed, but it is fully constructed today. Our Discovery Park project which you have previously seen down there south of the interchange. Then our City of Columbia project for the Cullimore Cottages. This is off of North Eighth and rear Coats. And then the University Subaru, which many of you probably are familiar with its location. They're off of I-70 Drive Southwest. And then, of course, our Ridenhour annexation permanent zoning, and we're not going to talk about annexation, just remember that. And then, of course, the Oakland Crossing project, the

same area, but it includes those outparcels that I had indicated that would be the M-N and the M-C. We will also, as we discussed this evening in our work session, we are going to spend a half of work session finishing up our discussion and some of your thoughts as it relates to the Rock Quarry Scenic Road Advisory Group's corridor plan for Rock Quarry Road as a result of Council direction through the SRO overlay for that particular roadway. And I believe we will also potentially have a discussion of our -- the pending in our status of where we are on our vacation rentals or VROB type of ADU usages that we have, that we've been discussing. So those are the items that are coming up. We do have other material that we'll be covering here over the next several work sessions as it relates to comprehensive plan related elements, as well as getting back, I think, into the scorecard discussion that we have been talking about, as well. That -- that is all we have for this evening. We thank you very much for your attention and your time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Appreciate your comments and the review of next meeting.

## IX. COMMISSION COMMENTS

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any comments from Commissioners? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a motion.

MR. STRODTMAN: Before you make your motion, Commissioners, I would like to make a statement. October 4th, I'm planning on being absent and Mr. Stanton made me aware this evening he's going to be absent also for the October 4th meeting. So if anyone else is not going to be here, if you could please, please let Mr. Zenner and Ms. Loe know because we could run into a quorum situation, and it's obviously a stacked meeting, so we definitely want to give notice if we have a concern.

## X. NEXT MEETING DATE - October 4, 2018 @ 7 pm (tentative)

## XI. ADJOURNMENT

MR. STRODTMAN: So with that, Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that we adjourn.

MR. STRODTMAN: Do we have a second?

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: We have a second. We are adjourned. Thank you.

(The meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.)

(Off the record.)