



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Board of Adjustment

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Council Chambers

Columbia City Hall

701 E. Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. CLITHERO: Call the March 13 Board of Adjustment Meeting to order.

MR. CLITHERO: Mr. Zenner, would you please call the roll?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. Mr. Hurley?

MR. Hurley: Here.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Clithero?

MR. CLITHERO: Here.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Clark?

MR. CLARK: Here.

MR. ZENNER: Ms. Hammen?

MS. HAMMEN: Here.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Waters?

MR. WATERS: Here.

MR. ZENNER: You have a quorum.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay. Thank you.

Present: 5 - Janet Hammen, Philip Clithero, Thomas Hurley, Andy Waters and John Clark

Excused: 2 - Martha John and Frederick Carroz

II. INTRODUCTIONS

Present: 5 - Janet Hammen, Philip Clithero, Thomas Hurley, Andy Waters and John Clark

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. CLITHERO: The agenda has been distributed in your packets. Motion for approval of the agenda?

MS. HAMMEN: So moved.

MR. WATERS: Second.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay. I have a motion to approve and a second. All in favor, say aye. Opposed, say nay.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

Motion to approve and a second approval of agenda

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. CLITHERO: The minutes have also been included in your packet. Are there any corrections or additions to the minutes? May I have a motion for approval?

MR. WATERS: So moved.

MS. HAMMEN: Second.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor, say aye. Opposed, say nay.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. CLITHERO: Hearing none, we have approved the minutes. Will the court reporter please swear in the staff.

(Staff was sworn.)

Motion and a second to approve minutes as submitted

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**Case # 1960**

A request by Tom Smith (attorney), on behalf of Columbia School District 93 (owner), to grant a variance to permit the construction of on-site parking spaces in excess of 200% of those required for the proposed new Southwest Middle School on property addressed as 5550 S. Sinclair Road which is not permitted per Sections 29-4.3, Table 4.3-1 and 29-4.3(e) of the Unified Development Code.

MR. CLITHERO: Has the property been properly advertised?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, it has.

MR. CLITHERO: Has the property been posted?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, it has.

MR. CLITHERO: Have the parties of interest been notified?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, they were.

MR. CLITHERO: Have there been any inquiries?

MR. ZENNER: No, there have not.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. CLITHERO: So would the person making application to the Board please come forward, state your name and address and be sworn in?

MR. SMITH: Good evening, members of the Board. My name is Tom Smith with the law firm of EdCounsel with offices at 2401 Bernadette Drive, Suite 117, Columbia, Missouri.

(Witness was sworn.)

MR. SMITH: I first want to thank you all for taking the time to be here tonight for this hearing. As you know, I represent Columbia Public Schools, and we're here tonight to talk about the new middle school that the district would like to build out at the Sinclair Farm off of Sinclair Road. Specifically, we're requesting that this Board grant CPS a variance from the requirements of Section 29-4.3(e) of the Development Code, which deals with the maximum parking allowed at newly constructed buildings.

Just as a matter of housekeeping, before we jump into this, I would like to request that Exhibits A, which is the variance application and its exhibits; and Exhibit B, which is the PowerPoint presentation you'll see here tonight; that those be admitted as evidence into the record. And I believe Mr. Caldera will take care of the ordinances, themselves.

MR. CALDERA: Mr. Clithero, just to make sure, did we get an affirmative on the admission of those exhibits?

MR. CLITHERO: Yes.

MR. CALDERA: Okay.

(Applicant Exhibits A and B were received into evidence.)

MR. SMITH: So now that that is out of the way, I want to briefly explain to you why CPS is requesting this variance, and then I'm going to let some much smarter individuals from ES&S come up and give you -- explain it better and answer any of the questions you might have tonight.

As you may or may not be aware with the passing of CPS's bond and tax issues, CPS has been mandated by its constituents to build a new middle school to help with the overcrowding at Gentry Middle School. The search for the property took a very long time. There were only a few sites that met the criteria needed to build this middle school, and after looking -- reviewing all of them more thoroughly, it was finally decided on Sinclair Farm was the best fit. So obviously the district has purchased that property and intends to construct a middle school there.

But while we were designing it, one thing that came up is a problem that we see at a lot of the other district's middle schools, and that's parking -- inadequate parking to cover special events -- nighttime events, registration, things like that. With those other middle schools it's not as big of a problem because they are located in pretty densely populated areas of the City. They can either park on the street or they can park in adjacent lots.

With this property as you'll see, it's kind of isolated at the moment. You can't -- there are no adjacent lots nearby that makes walking practical, and you can't park on the side of Sinclair Road. You can, but your car is going to be in a ditch, and you'll probably get hit while you are walking onto the property. So with that in mind, we thought about

how can we alleviate this parking problem.

And the obvious answer was have additional parking that can accommodate those events. And we're not going into this blindly. We've thought very hard about it. You'll hear from ES&S that how we got to the final number of spaces that we're asking for and why we picked that number. You'll also hear that this is a unique set of circumstances that makes it so that by granting this variance, you are not creating a precedent in the future to grant a variance for similar applications.

And finally, we're going to show you that the public safety and welfare will be secured by granting this variance and allowing the additional parking on this site. But in addition to all of that, you're also going to see that we are -- with the exception of the parking, we intend to follow the letter of the Code. We're going to follow the Development Code in all respects for the rest of the site.

We're going to provide an -- in some cases, we're going to go over what is required by the Code. We're going to provide an abundance of green space on the property to help try to mitigate that impact of the park-- the additional parking. So with all that in mind, I'm going to turn it over to ES&S to come up and kind of walk you through the site, and what we plan to do there, and why this parking variance is so important.

MR. THOMAS: Good evening. My name is Zac Thomas; I'm with Engineering Surveys & Services at 1113 Fay Street, Columbia, Missouri.

(Witness was sworn.)

MR. THOMAS: Again, I'm Zac Thomas with Engineering Surveys & Services, and we're doing the civil site design for CPS for this project. So to lead into the project, I prepared a PowerPoint presentation here. And I know Tom has already touched on some of this, and I'll give you a little bit of a history and an update on the current schedule with where we're at with the project.

First of all, why have the project in the first place? We need another middle school. CPS has experienced a rapid enrollment growth over the last ten-plus years, which leads to overcrowding, of course. And so it's no secret that CPS has built several elementary schools in the last ten years to address this, and even a new high school. So what's the squeeze in the middle is middle schools, and hence why they are building a new middle school to alleviate that overcrowding issue.

Another major factor is to reduce trailers. CPS has made it well known that they have a long-range goal of reducing the number of trailers in the district, and they have greatly reduced them over the last ten-plus years. This project again will alleviate crowding, which will further allow them to achieve their goal of reducing trailers.

Getting into a little bit of the history of the project, in April of 2016, the voters

approved CPS to proceed forward with land purchase and start design of the new middle school. In 2017, CPS purchased 63 acres in southwest Columbia, and it's on the east side of Sinclair Road. December 2017, which was just last December, a land disturbance permit was issued by the City for site clearing and demo only. So if you were to go out to the site now, you will see that clearing of the vegetation within approved areas only has proceeded, and they are demo'ing some old asphalt that was left on the project from previous development.

January of this year, the preliminary plat was approved. And currently, we have submitted civil site plans to the City and we are in the review process with them to achieve eventual approval and permitting for the actual construction of the -- of the project itself. The intent is to actually start construction this spring, which will lead to -- the school will be open in the fall of 2020. This is a major important milestone; CPS has promised this to the district and to the City itself, and so this is extremely important to stay on the schedule as promised.

To get you a little bit familiar with the site itself, you can see here -- here is an aerial photo. I've outlined the site in red. It is, as I said, on the east side of Sinclair Road. It is developed on the north and the east sides with residential development. The west and the south sides are undeveloped. You can see the site itself is primarily maybe abandoned agricultural fields with some woods -- wooded areas as you go to the north.

The only site access will be on Sinclair Road, which is along the western property line. Sinclair Road has currently been classified by the City as a major collector road, and it does not meet those requirements yet as far as the cross section goes, but it will be -- there will be some road improvements that CPS will construct with this project. They will be -- it will involve improved vehicular access via some turn lanes onto Sinclair, and improved pedestrian access via the construction of sidewalks along Sinclair.

I'm mentioning this now because it is important to realize that none of these proposed improvements either by CPS or even in the future by others under this major collector classification is to accommodate any type of on-street parking. There is no intent now or in the future to ever allow on-street parking along Sinclair.

Exhibit 5, which was included in our original variance request packet, is shown here on this slide, and this kind of gives you a little bit of a breakdown of the site. This is kind of a first look of the layout for the middle school itself. You can see it's going to be focused on the south end of the site. You can see the building there in the middle.

There are actually three parking lots proposed around it. You can see the track and football field proposed on the east side. The blue indicates a large detention basin that is going to be planned to address storm water needs for the site. The green area is

preserved area, primarily woods that will remain even post this project.

Something else to consider is if you look just north of the proposed middle school site, you see this is labeled a future elementary school. That is not locked in at all, but this is an area that will -- that CPS has set aside for future development. This site -- this project will grade that site to kind of get it pad ready; however, nothing has been locked in at this, so I don't want anyone thinking that this will be an elementary school because it's not locked in, but it will be some type of CPS project in the future.

Now, the reason why we are showing it is because the idea is that whatever goes in there, it will share that parking lot that's on the north side of the middle school that will be constructed. So the intent is to -- in the future is to share some of this parking with future CPS development.

Here again is an even more zoomed in look at the site, so you can now again see the building. You can see the three separate parking lots. Just for reference sake, we've called them the north lot, the west lot and the south lot.

Okay. So we're building a new middle school. How much parking is required on site? The first thing CPS did was they had the advantage of having other very similar sites throughout the city. What are their current parking requirements? How much parking are they currently providing?

We are showing here -- here are two middle schools. We have Gentry, which was opened in 1992, and it is the closest middle school to this site. And we have Lange, which was opened in 1997. You can see Gentry has currently on site 208 parking spaces. It does have an additional 112 spaces at Bethel Park. That is actually to the south. That picture is -- rotates, so it is to your right you can see kind of this overflow parking, which has a total of 320 spaces.

Lange, it now has 292 spaces on site, which is evident there of a -- built another project there that added additional parking here recently to the site. But they are up to 292 now. These are two examples, but it is important to note that these sites, along with all the middle school sites, currently experience parking shortages.

The main issue that they have is most of these sites have adequate parking for typical daytime school activities. That's not an issue. The -- primarily, the issue with parking shortages is during special events. These can include registration, parent/teacher conferences -- they can even include sporting events. This is a middle school, so maybe a rival school would be playing or something like that.

These are all evening events. This is when the shortages happen. And this is when - as a lot of parents have experienced, you get there, you're parking on the streets. I know Gentry has had issues -- actually, my daughter goes to Jeff, and I've parked blocks

away at times during some of these events with parking shortages.

Historical trends, why weren't these original sites built with more parking then? One was from '92 and the other one was from '97. Everything, you know, evolves, changes over time. Some theories here are both parents attend, maybe at higher percentages now, requiring additional parking.

Both parents work at higher percentages. They might all have to drive separately then. Maybe one of them has to leave early to go to work or one of them is showing up late because they're coming from work. Other family member attendance might be in higher percentages -- grandparents, family members, all these things that can ebb and flow over time.

I think these have all been trending upward to increase the parking demand for these special events. Again, as I have already said, it's no big secret that these -- that the other CPS middle schools experience parking shortages during their special events.

Safety, this particular site located off of Sinclair Road is unique, as Tom alluded to too, in that there is no overflow parking. Whenever it opens, there won't be anything available. Parking on Sinclair Road is simply not an option. This photo here is a photo of Sinclair Road that was taken last summer actually at the site. So you're looking at Sinclair Road from the site, and you can see it is currently an unimproved asphalt road with ditches.

Obviously, there is no room for parking in any kind of safe manner currently on there. And again, to the north and the east, you've got residential development, obviously not an option for parking there. And to the south and to the west, it's undeveloped, so no options there.

So what type of parking -- how much parking is going to be required? How much is the demand from these special events? CPS has determined that up to 700 visitors plus 75 CPS staff can attend the most major of these special events. CPS has figured two people per car. Seven hundred divided by two is 350 cars for the visitors plus one car per staff is 75 cars. You add them up, you get 425 cars total would be the maximum parking demand for the special events at middle schools.

Basically, CPS is just simply requesting 425 based on what they've experienced at other schools. They do not want to build a brand new school that immediately has parking shortages with the first special event. So they are simply trying to adapt to the trends and provide parking that they are seeing -- experiencing at their other schools.

Variance required, why are we here, basically? Table 4.3-1 in the City Code requires three spaces per classroom. This project will -- is planning for 54 classrooms upon construction completion in 2020, plus up to 12 future classrooms in the future, for a total

of 66 classrooms for this middle school project. Take 66 and times it by 3 spaces per classroom, you're at 198 spaces. While 198 spaces may be adequate for your typical daytime, you know, in-school parking usage, it is simply inadequate for what CPS is experiencing for the special events.

The Code does have some leeway. It says you can provide up to 200 percent without having to go -- having to go and request a variance. Take 198 and times it by two, you're up to 396 spaces. We're getting closer, but we're still not to the 425 that CPS needs in order to truly accommodate all these special events.

Basically, the three spaces per classroom parking requirements in Table 4.3-1, we feel is inadequate for what the current demand is that CPS is seeing at special events. It probably is adequate for typical daytime usage, but it's during these special events is when it just simply is inadequate for those -- for that type of parking demand. Therefore, CPS is requesting the variance for 425 to account for actual real world parking demand experienced at their other middle schools for special events and not just typical daytime school hour usage.

CPS is requesting additional parking. How are they addressing it with environmental impact reductions? There are actual multiple on site design features that are included in the project to reduce the environmental impacts from the parking. Going back to Exhibit 5 that we saw in earlier slides, there are multiple environmentally friendly designs that are incorporated.

You can see in the green all to the north, that is all to remain undisturbed forest, and that is 35 percent of the entire site is going to remain woods. A total of 86 percent of the site will remain green space, whether it be the woods, you know, the football field, the track area, lawn areas. It will remain pervious of green space. The storm water has been designed to reduce the flows from all the parking that we've got proposed and meeting all City Codes, and the parking is actually proposed in three separate lots.

I know that they are proposing 425 spaces. They are not proposing a single 425-space lot. You can see there highlighted in yellow, it's three distinct lots, and by doing that, that will eliminate the sea of parking effect. I know a lot of times we think of large parking lots -- you think of in front of WalMart. I always think of Kauffman Stadium where the Royals play. That is a sea of parking, and I sit there and I look at it and I say it would be nice to have some islands and trees out there. We have purposefully broken these up to not have that effect, and to soften the effect, and to eliminate the sea of parking look.

Again with Exhibit 3, taking a closer look at the site itself, each lot is separated, and there is good separation between them. We have at least 190 feet in between each one of the lots with at least 80 feet of green space in between each one of them. And if you

look at each lot individually, it currently meets City of Columbia landscaping requirements, with one of those including a minimum 10 percent of internal landscaping.

You can see here if you look at each one of the lots, we're meeting that 10 percent requirement with islands. And the islands are spread out within the parking lot, and trees of medium to large size are planned and will be planted in these islands that will provide shade to reduce the heat island effect from them.

And all lots are at least 20 feet away -- and that's really only on that south lot there. That's 20 feet just in that one area there, with the average being 50-plus feet from all the lots from the property line, therefore minimizing the impacts to any adjacent properties. You combine all this together and you get a project that has addressed environmental impacts with this additional parking.

So in conclusion, that's why we are here tonight is to simply -- we would like to request a variance to Section 29-4.3(e) to allow up to 425 parking spaces as depicted in Exhibit 3, which you saw earlier, twice, in the presentation, so that simply CPS can provide safe, adequate, onsite parking for all school events, both special events and during daytime activities that are provided and scheduled for the school.

So with that, I will close and would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

MS. HAMMEN: I have one question. So the access is only going to be from Sinclair Road to and from the school?

MR. THOMAS: It will be -- let me back up here -- via three separate entrances. If you look there, you can see on the left-hand side, there will be three separate entrances onto Sinclair Road.

MS. HAMMEN: Are you making sure that neighbors are going to want access to the property, whether cars or their children walking -- you know, so on?

MR. THOMAS: From other properties?

MS. HAMMEN: Yeah.

MR. THOMAS: I do not anticipate that. That's not common at other CPS sites. There's also some security concerns that go with that. And so obviously to the east, it's developed residential lots. They are not going to want any kind of direct access for that.

And to the north, you've got all those preserved woods. There is actually a big drawl in there, so there are a lot of geographic constraints that would limit any kind of access from the north on that.

MR. WATERS: It looks like there is a street stubbed out to the south. Is that -- is that what that is?

MR. THOMAS: No. It does look like that. You're right. That is actually a turnaround for large semitrailers to back into the dock. Yeah.

MR. WATERS: Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: Uh-huh. Yeah?

MR. CLARK: I guess I'm new to this. So if I understand, so is the variance request just for that 7 percent increase, meaning you've already secured -- and this may just be about the process. The director, Mr. Teddy, I believe, can approve the up to 200 percent. And so -- but is the variance request for 200 percent plus the 7 or is it just for that 7 percent? I guess that means Mr. Teddy already approved the up to 200 percent?

MR. THOMAS: No, he hasn't. This is for -- since we are requesting a number that is above the 200 percent, it is for the entire --

MR. CLARK: It's -- okay.

MR. THOMAS: It's for the entire 425.

MR. CLARK: Yeah. The other thing, I noticed you mentioned the 10 percent, and I guess in one of my notes here it says -- I guess in the 29-4.4(f), interior parking lot as required by that -- if I understand it's a requirement to be increased to 20 percent from the 10 percent, do I have that correct and does your plan actually meet the 20 percent if that's correct?

MR. THOMAS: The plan does not meet the 20 percent. We do meet the 10 percent required. And with these additional -- the separation of the parking, the keeping it from the property lines, the distances that we have indicated -- the 50-plus feet on average, combined, these provide adequate mitigation for environmental impacts.

MR. CLITHERO: Any other questions?

MR. HURLEY: So the 12 future classrooms, to me that seems a little bit disingenuous to be including those in the parking request for this application. That's an increase of 20 percent, which results in over a hundred extra spaces or 30 percent increase in parking lot size based on a projection that may or may not occur. So I just wanted that to be on the record and make you aware of that.

MR. THOMAS: The -- we have provided, if you actually look at Exhibit 3, if you look up to the northwest corner of the building, you can see a dashed line. And that is intentional green space that has been left for those future spaces for those future classrooms. It will be two story to get them in there, but it is planned for -- you know, for these -- for this additional classrooms. When that will happen -- I mean, there is obviously nothing set in stone, but the site has been provided to accommodate future expansion.

MR. HURLEY: Will there be another variance request to come in front of this Board upon the completion of that or is this parking -- will this -- no one can tell the future, and I understand that. Is it fair to say that there will not be another request made because the

considerations have been made here by increasing the number of classrooms by over 20 percent? Those considerations have already been taken into account; is that appropriate?

MR. THOMAS: Yeah. Yeah. That's why we are here to try to prevent having to come back and do this again.

MR. HURLEY: Okay.

MR. THOMAS: Uh-huh.

MS. HAMMEN: So actually you won't build 425 parking spaces at this time because of the anticipated ones that will be added later; is that correct?

MR. THOMAS: No. We are going to build the 425 now, and we will not -- we will not build the 12 additional classrooms yet. But whenever they're built, adequate parking will already be in place then for those 12 classrooms.

MS. HAMMEN: Right. Right. Okay.

MR. THOMAS: Yeah. But the 425 will be built with this project.

MS. HAMMEN: What are the dashed lines again?

MR. THOMAS: That is where those 12 classrooms will go. That's a building expansion. They'll obviously have to take out some sidewalk you saw there -- you see there. The rest of it will be green space, and we'll have it graded so it's close to finish grade of the existing school, so minimize grading, things of that sort. And we've purposefully kept utilities out of that area so they don't have to move those and such.

MR. CLITHERO: Any other questions?

MR. CLARK: I guess I'm new then. So to make sure, if in fact this 29-4.4 at the 20 percent is the requirement and you're planning to meet it in a certain way, does that mean you are applying for a variance from the 20 percent and proposing that the other design characteristics effectively meet that? I'm not sure what the legal structure is there.

MR. THOMAS: We're requesting a variance from -- what number was it --

MR. SMITH: May I address it?

MR. THOMAS: Okay.

MR. SMITH: The Code itself that we're actually looking at, if you look at that part that talks about the 20 percent landscaping requirement, it's separate and apart from the over 200 percent requirement asking for a variance. So it's 10 percent for up to 100 percent parking, and from 100 percent to 200 percent, it requires the 20 percent landscaping.

There is no percentage landscaping requirement under going over 200 percent. The -- it's not listed in there. So what we are asking for is a variance from the parking

maximum, so that we can go up to 425 spaces and we -- the design you see in front of you still meets that original 10 percent landscaping requirement.

So the 20 percent under the Code only applies when you're between 100 and 200 percent of your maximum parking. That's the letter of the Code. If you read it on its face, that's what it says. There is no 20 percent landscaping requirement under that asking for a variance to go over 200 percent.

So our request is that the 10 percent -- the original 10 percent that would apply still applies here. And we have shown you these environmental impact mitigating measures as an example of why the 20 percent isn't necessary in this case.

We have not only broken the 425 spaces into three different lots, you also see a ton of green space in between each lot. We have the 10 percent landscaping requirement within each lot; we have a storm water basin that's going to take all that storm water runoff and help mitigate; and then the parking lots are far enough away from the property lines of our neighbors that we're not going to be dumping storm water on to them.

And then 35 percent of the north side of the property is going to remain woods, and underneath that, you know, I don't have the percentages, but between the woods and the school, you've also got a very large chunk of green space there too. So our request is just that the 10 percent be applied to us rather than the 20 percent, and that we would be given -- granted a variance to go up to 425 parking spaces with no other conditions attached to that, such as a 20 percent landscaping requirement. And I can go into more detail about why that is impractical if you would like.

Essentially what it comes down to, you know, I already talked about the legal aspect of it. It's not required by the Code. There is also the practical aspect of it. We don't -- we've put in the mitigating measures.

We -- and in addition to this, if we were required to put in the 20 percent landscaping, the footprint of those parking lots is going to expand. So you're going to actually add more impervious surface on the site than if you were to have the 10 percent landscaping requirement. In addition to that, it's going to cost CPS about \$100,000 to do it. That's a pretty big chunk of change, even on a project this big.

We would rather spend that money elsewhere within the district, specifically on students, instead of paying to add additional landscaping when we already have so much green space and woods on the property to begin with. And we've taken measures to ensure that the impact of having the 425 spaces is mitigated in other ways. So, you know, our position is the 10 percent should be required not only because that's what's required under the Code -- if you read the letter of the Code, there's no 20 percent requirement when you go over 200 percent of parking.

And from a practical standpoint, this is the best option for the district and for the City. There are other things in here that mitigate the environmental impact, which is what the landscaping requirement is all about.

MR. CLITHERO: Anything else? All right. Thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the application? Anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the application? Seeing none, I'll close the public hear --

MR. CALDERA: We actually keep the public hearing open until after Mr. Zenner has had an opportunity to present to give the applicant an opportunity to rebut any testimony that --

MR. CLITHERO: So we keep the public hearing open then?

MR. CALDERA: Keep it open --

MR. CLITHERO: Okay. That's fine.

MR. CALDERA: -- until they have had a chance to rebut, and then we will close it.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay. Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think our applicants have done a fine job of presenting the property this evening. I think to address some of the more specific standards, yes, we are looking at a 7 percent increase over the 200 percent that could be administratively approved. That equates to roughly 28 additional parking spaces.

To answer Mr. Clark's question, no, the director has not been asked to approve the 200 percent maximum based on the justification requirements that are identified in the other administrative provisions which would specifically require 20 percent landscaping should they have sought director approval. And should they, as they have pointed out here this evening, desired to maintain the 10 percent, they would have been before the Board asking for a different variance. And that would be to eliminate the 20 percent requirement to have a 10 percent requirement.

So this evening what we have accomplished basically is come to the Board, ask for 425 parking spaces to be approved, and render a decision based upon one of two potential options. Staff has provided its opinion that while the 20 percent is identified as a requirement of the 100 to 200 administrative approval, it also believes that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. And when you come to the Board of Adjustment and you ask to go over the maximum amount that has a 20 percent provision within it, that the Board needs to give consideration should that 20 percent be required when they ask for more.

It is a recommendation; it is not a requirement. And therefore, the Board can take our recommendation and you can take whatever testimony you have had this evening as compelling arguments to arrive at your final conclusion. We point out as I said looking at

this from a goose and a gander position, that what one would have to do if they were coming in and asking for administrative approval, getting 28 spaces less, we'd have 200 or 20 percent landscaped area, and we felt that that was appropriate to bring forward.

So really as that relates to that particular point of this application, we are making a recommendation that the Board can consider. Applicant has provided an alternative opinion as to why that is not necessarily needed. That is the Board's prerogative to determine if that's compelling enough or not. Mine is to defend the Code and defend the standards that are within the Code that would apply equally across anybody else.

I agree that that is a different legal perspective to take than what Mr. Smith has provided you this evening that we don't have the right to offer that as an alternative. I respectfully disagree with Mr. Smith's position. It is my responsibility to provide you a factual reasoning as to why certain conditions should be able to be considered, and the Board has to render its decision based on the facts that it has heard this evening and if it believes that that is a hardship or not.

I think the information that has been presented this evening is very factual. This is a remote school location in comparison to any of the other CPS middle school sites here within Boone County, especially within the city of Columbia. Most of our middle school sites that -- if you have travelled the city are in urbanized areas where we do have adequate on-street parking.

Our public street road network that surrounds these middle schools in other locations is intended for parking. Neighbors may not like it; however, it is still there and it is normally available. We also have our locations -- do have opportunities normally to have city park space that may be adjacent to or somehow connected with a school site itself which provides for overflow parking, and the Gentry example is a wonderful one to utilize because Bethel does have that opportunity and helps to provide overflow. This particular school will not have that at the time it opens. It will not have any real other infrastructure improvements surrounding it that provide for any type of public network offset from the site. And to be quite honest, from a public safety perspective, I think, which is what the applicant has presented this evening, accommodation of that type of overflow parking on the site is to the public's best interest which is what we as a staff generally through the administration of its Code would say would be an appropriate opportunity to identify that as a condition unique to this property given its location, and therefore, is something worth of the Board's consideration.

Ironically as you probably noticed within our staff report under the impact summary, Item No. 1, when we adopted the new Unified Development Code, the parking requirements actually for middle and high school sites went up. So obviously the way that we have parked at our middle school and high school sites in the past has been -- it

has been woefully inadequate, and it is still not going to be adequate.

Our parking standards are based on national trends and based on folks that work within other locations. And I think Mr. Thomas pointed out here this evening very eloquently that in fact that may be appropriate during the regular school day, but when we have a district that is as active as it is in how we involve our students in a variety of other activities, the parking requirements aren't structured that our staff can go and say, Well, we've got an auditorium, we've got a football field and stadium, and we break out all of the parking individually and we dump it all back together.

We have a single parking standard for a school and that is what we go to. We don't break it into its individual parts. If it was broken into its individual parts, potentially we wouldn't be here either. But that is not how we calculate parking demand. We look at the use, and that use again is based upon more national trends.

So we do have, as we have pointed out, our compliance of the variance criteria. We are not doing anything here should the variance be granted that would allow construction that would not otherwise be allowed in our agricultural zoning district. A school is a principle permitted use in that district.

We're not doing anything that would permit development inconsistent with our Comprehensive Plan. And this is something possibly that we've really never talked very much about before the Board, but when we look at issues as it relates to environmentally responsible development and integrating the ability to have neighborhoods that are livable and sustainable -- and I think this goes to some point of why we wouldn't really want interconnections between school sites generally from a vehicular perspective between school sites and neighborhoods.

Pedestrian connections is something that when available we would probably want that. Even if we don't provide them physically, they'll get created organically. People will cut through individual's backyards, through the forest, however they want to get to school to get there as quickly as possible if they walk. Given that this location is somewhat rural in its nature and development and then surrounded by somewhat exclusive residential environments to the east and to the north -- and the ones to the north especially are going to be even further separated due to the green space that is being maintained and the topographic and other environmental features, you likely will not see any desire nor real usage probably of trails or things of that nature that connect back and forth.

The public sidewalk connections that will be made along Sinclair are a requirement of our subdivision and zoning standards as well as are the street improvements. Those will provide probably the best connectivity from a pedestrian perspective as possible, but that

does not necessarily help with the parking requirements. Parents probably won't park in a remote subdivision and walk down those sidewalks to get to a special event.

Again, capturing everything on site is likely an appropriate action here for public safety and welfare. So I would tell you that based on our analysis of the staff report of the request -- and it is odd to have come from our staff a recommendation of approval -- we do believe that this is a justified hardship associated with the location of the property, the need to ensure that we have adequate public safety maintained and incorporation of the actual parking internal to the site.

So the 28 spaces is not that objectionable. It's not objectionable at all to be quite honest. We believe it is appropriate based upon the documentation that has been supplied. The environmental related features associated with this, while we commend the district for that, typically an individual would either be meeting the requirement or seeking relief from the Board.

And we do feel that the 20 percent landscaping may be warranted. However, I can and do see the points that the applicant has raised in relationship to the separation of the parking lots, the amount of green space that will be retained on the site, even with a potential secondary building being constructed and all of the other features that are being preserved -- tree preservation, which is beyond what we would require regulatorily and the site lines as it relates to these parking areas. The building, as you look at this diagram that's on your screens in front of you, shields basically parking in the west parking lot and the south parking lot from any adjacent development.

The north parking lot really is the only parking area that potentially could be visible from adjacent residential development to the east and possibly to the north. However, to the north, the visibility of that parking area is probably remote, at best. And to the west or to the east, may very well be limited due to the retained canopy that they are maintaining on the site that is not required.

The school district through the platting side of this has determined that they are going to preserve those trees outside of the mandatory 25 percent climax forest that has to be retained, so we are having a buffer being provided between them. With that being said, we would support the request. While we would request that the Board do give consideration to the requirement of the additional 20 percent -- or the 10 percent landscaping internally, as I had stated earlier, we feel from a staff perspective that what is good for the goose should be good for the gander.

There is no guarantee that you are able to meet the lesser standard coming to the Board of Adjustment, and we felt that it was our obligation to raise to the Board for their consideration that equality that would apply to somebody that choose to just develop 28

fewer parking spaces. They would have to meet 20 percent versus somebody that came in and requested 425 -- 28 more and then seeking to not have to provide what their neighbor who provides up to 200 and not coming through the Board would have.

The way to view that possibly is, is that bonus of avoiding the Board of Adjustment is give us the extra 10 percent landscaping -- come to the Board of Adjustment, you can either take your chances with the staff saying we want the extra 10 percent and the Board saying, No, we really don't think that that's appropriate. So again, I leave that as a parting remark to you that the Board can make the decision as to should it require additional landscaping as required or not. It is just a recommendation; it is not a requirement.

MR. CLARK: So just to make sure I understand the goose/gander thing, the idea is they came and asked for the variance. They could have come in hand with the 200 in hand already and asked for the 7 percent or they could have just gone with the 200 percent. And in that world, actually, they would have only had to have the 10 percent.

MR. ZENNER: No. They would have been required to have the 20 percent --

MR. CLARK: Oh, okay.

MR. ZENNER: -- and if they didn't want to provide the 20 --

MR. CLARK: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: -- but the 10, they would have been here, but under a separate variance request.

MR. CLARK: Okay.

MS. HAMMEN: What does 20 percent more landscaping look like? I mean, twice as many islands or make the lot bigger and it would take up more of the green space that's around it? Or how would that --

MR. ZENNER: In essence -- and I would -- it's more of a design function that our design professionals here representing CPS could better explain to you, but I'll try in a nutshell. Typically, you would basically enlarge your islands or you would put more in in order to take -- have opportunity to plant more vegetation. So right now we require so many trees per linear feet or number of parking spaces or square footage of pavement.

So, in essence, if I recall correctly, it's one tree for every 4,000 square feet of pavement -- if I recall. You would basically be doubling that, so that's where your cost comes into play. And then, of course, as Mr. Thomas pointed out -- and I think is unintuitive, we would say that the Code is trying to reduce the environmental impact; however, as you have to add more landscaping, you're generally going to spread the parking lots out.

So it's a reverse intuition thing here. You're actually going to expand the parking lots

most likely. Ultimately, the increase in the landscaping standard is used really more as a general disincentive. Now coming to the Board, those types of general disincentives are -- can be set aside based upon testimony provided.

And you try to discourage folks by building excessive parking when it is not necessarily needed except for maybe one day of the year after Thanksgiving. And you want green -- green in a parking lot that normally has more asphalt. I think, again, from an intuitive perspective, it generally would reduce heat and solar gain and all the other environmental things that are bad about having excessive parking.

This particular site has broken the mass up, so when we think about horrible parking situations, you normally think about shopping malls where they are heavily concentrated. This is not the scenario, and I think the applicant through the site design has been sensitive to that to the extent that maybe it is an opportunity that they've -- they've fallen into possibly, not necessarily one that they realize that we would probably be coming out as a staff and saying we want 20 percent landscaping even though you've distributed your parking.

But ultimately, yeah, you would end up adding more islands. You would probably spread the parking out in order to get the green space in for the parking area. Staff will have to come back and look at this at a -- I think as we come back and look at the Code and potential revisions to the Code, we may need to look at the practicalities to it and what options exist to achieve the goal that we are trying to get at, and that's really how do we reduce the environmental impact possibly of additional paving.

It's not possible by increasing the internal landscaping within a parking area. It may be looking at different opportunities that are best management practices for storm water management or other features, such as distributive parking areas instead of interconnected parking systems that basically result in more travel aisles between parking areas and the like.

MR. CLARK: So in looking at this, do I gather on the map here, these little circles are actually the islands?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK: And so I count those up in all three, there are like 11. And so if you went from 10 percent to 20 percent, it's like having 11 more islands. And that's a lot of where that additional space would come from. Have I got that kind of right?

MR. ZENNER: That's correct. Because each island generally is going to occupy, if I am correct, probably two to four parking spaces in order to have sufficient space in which to have a tree planting area for survivability. And a lot of that is determined through the landscaping provisions of the City Code.

MR. CLARK: So if you're going to the two and we had to have another 11, that's like 22 parking spaces of area and so forth. I guess the other thing I noticed here is the south and the west lots are pretty space constrained. So if you're doing that, you're reducing the number there and having to move everything up to the north.

It might be different if it was not that constrained. Okay. That answers my question.

MR. WATER: But that's where the catch-22 comes in. If you start adding more islands, than you're increasing the impervious surface at least as much as you're mitigating it by adding the islands. Right?

MR. ZENNER: I would -- I would suggest -- and I slept at the Holiday Inn Express, but I'm not an engineer, but I think that's probably a pretty good conclusion. While the tree planting islands would be permeable in nature, you're continuing to push that out. And I think Mr. Clark's point is as you push the parking areas out, you get them closer to the adjacent properties or you have to shift where your parking is distributed to, and that may be in a location that's less desirable from a public perspective -- from a public health, safety and welfare perspective because you have visual welfare that we want to protect as well. I would view that --

MR. CLITHERO: I'm not an engineer, but it seems intuitive to me that if we double the amount of island space in there, we would more than that amount increase the footprint of the parking lot, which would then be covering more landscape area, which would reduce the amount of pervious area that we have. That makes absolutely no sense to me. It just makes no sense that we would require something that would take away from the environmental impact.

MR. ZENNER: And I think as I said, that's why the Code may need to be reexamined as we move into the next round of amendments -- unintended consequences of newer provisions.

MR. CLITHERO: Yeah.

MR. CLARK: So my last question to you is reading the staff's recommendation in our packet, that's why there's no mention of either condition that's mentioned at the top of that page. I mean, the 15 percent landscaped areas is taken care of otherwise. This 20 percent was the other thing.

And I wondered why you didn't say anything about the conditions, and now I understand why. Your recommendation is basically just flat out to approve the variance as it is applied for without kind of furthering limiting it in any way. That's the staff's recommendation?

MR. ZENNER: I would -- I would say that our recommendation is we wanted to raise the issue to the Board.

MR. CLARK: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: Yes. That is correct. Approve it with the applicant's submission as depicted in Exhibit 3, which is what you are looking at.

MR. CLITHERO: Comments from legal?

MR. CALDERA: All right. A few housekeeping things. I want to make sure that we've got a clean record, so at this time we are going to try -- we are going to move to admit some exhibits.

First I want to make sure that we get the relevant ordinances entered into evidence. So at this time the City seeks to move 29-6.1, 29-6.4 and 29-4.3 into evidence as City Exhibit 1.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay.

(City Exhibit 1 was received into evidence.)

MR. CALDERA: Let the record reflect that they were admitted. As well as that exhibit, we would like to admit the staff report to the Board of Adjustment into evidence as City Exhibit 2.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay.

(City Exhibit 2 was received into evidence.)

MR. CALDERA: And then, finally, there's some additional attachments with the notice that I want to make sure are in the record as well. Applicant Exhibits 1 through 5, locator -- the locator maps, the public notice, and the parties in interest letter and lists. The City would seek to admit that as City Exhibit 3.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay.

(City Exhibit 3 was received into evidence.)

MR. CALDERA: So now that is done, my standard spiel. As the Board is aware, there are specific criteria that they must consider before granting a variance. The Code lays those out. There are five specific cat-- or five specific criteria that they must consider and find before granting a variance, and they are all found under 29-6.4(d)(ii). I'm happy to read those out loud right now if the Board would like.

MR. CLARK: I'm new. I've got them in front of me. I'm less interested in reading them out loud then -- other than it's just a matter of procedure. I believe that's the a, b, c, d and e. As opposed to just voting, I'd prefer to vote on a, then on b, c, d -- I think that can go very quickly. But there are those five steps.

MR. CALDERA: If I'm understanding your comment correctly, are you essentially asking to do a roll call vote through each criteria?

MR. CLARK: Right.

MR. CALDERA: I would actually advise against that because you actually have to

find all five criteria to grant the variance, so it would actually I think be an unnecessary step.

MR. CLARK: I must admit I may be overruled, but I tend -- I tend to like doing step-by-step -- I've been involved in some recent things where we bunched it altogether and the record going forward in that case weakened the position that we had taken.

MR. CALDERA: That is something I'll leave to the Board to decide. Practically speaking, Pat, I think that you can do that, but I'll leave that to the Board to decide if that's what they want to do. If so, I would say I think we would probably benefit from a motion and a second to have that.

MR. CLARK: Okay.

MR. CALDERA: Otherwise, we would proceed with our standard operating procedure.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay.

MR. CLARK: Well, just to make it, I'll make the motion that we do that.

MR. CALDERA: Second?

MR. CLITHERO: No second.

MR. CALDERA: So having mentioned that there are five criteria specifically laid out, I did want to make a couple of brief comments in regards to Mr. Clark's points earlier, which I believe all parties have addressed at this point, but I want to make sure that legal has had an opportunity to weigh in. In regards to 29-4.3(e) and the 10 percent, 20 percent process, we actually agree with both Mr. Smith and Mr. Zenner. Our interpretation is that the 10 percent is what is required.

The 20 percent is a nice little incentive when you are seeking for 200 percent -- up to 200 percent parking spaces and allows you to resolve the matter with the director. And then the third option, which actually is silent on the percentages says bring a variance forward. So our reading is that the 20 percent applies only to that 100 percent to 200 percent window, and then the variance for you all would include the 10 percent that everybody is discussing.

So I want to make sure that that is clear. With that said, that's all the comments I believe I have.

MR. HURLEY: May I ask a question? So is it appropriate to include the percentage required in the variance granted over 200 percent? Could that be a portion of the variance?

MR. CALDERA: So actually thank you for jogging my memory here. So as Mr. Zenner correctly stated, the request before you right now is 10 -- the request is for 425 spots. They are going to give 10 percent. If the Board would like to add a condition onto

there -- you know, 20 percent, 30 percent, whatever the number may be, you absolutely can do that.

But one thing I would strongly advise the Board to do since the applicant is the one that is responsible and controls the request throughout, if you are going to go down that route and add those conditions, I would give the applicant an opportunity to come up and weigh in on whether or not that's something they even want because they obviously have some objections and concerns to that. So I hope that answered your question.

MR. HURLEY: It does, yeah. Thank you.

MR. CALDERA: Okay.

MR. CLITHERO: Would you like to respond to that?

MR. CALDERA: Oh, and I apologize. Actually, we were supposed to give Mr. Smith an opportunity to rebut Mr. Zenner.

MR. SMITH: Well, just a few points, and I don't know if Mr. Thomas will want to come up here as well for any of this. We do appreciate the staff's recommendation to approve the 425 spots. Obviously, we do disagree with the amount of landscaping that should be required.

And I want to be clear, I didn't say you don't have the right to require the 20 percent. My argument was that as Mr. Caldera put it, it's not required under the Code. The letter of the Code does not say if you go over 200 percent of parking, you have to have 20 percent landscaping. We are asking that you use your discretion as the Board to only require the 10 percent. And we have given you those reasons. We have gone over them.

And, Mr. Clithero, you are exactly right. Increasing the part -- the landscaping requirement is going to increase the footprint of the parking lot to the extent of almost 6,000 square feet. You're losing impervious -- you're losing permeable surface in exchange for impervious surface if you increase to the 20 percent landscaping requirement. I understand that Mr. Zenner needs to apply the Code evenly across the board.

You know, what's good for the goose is good for the gander, but this isn't your normal situation where you would be applying it equally because we're not coming here as someone who is going to build a PetSmart off of 63 and 70. We're not coming in and trying to build a shopping mall. We are coming in as a school district, another public entity, telling you that we have a problem with our parking.

We are telling you that we have a problem with doing 20 percent landscape, so we've taken measures to mitigate that to do other things other than the 20 percent landscaping to address the issues that the landscaping requirement would be addressing. This isn't a normal situation. These are unique circumstances.

You have the discretion under the Code to allow us to do the 10 percent landscaping. That's what is normally required up to 100 percent and there is no requirement once you go over 200 percent. We are asking that you apply the normal requirement of 10 percent to us. And this isn't a situation where we only have one or two special events a year.

For any of you that have had kids that have gone through -- gone through the public school system, even at CPS, there are numerous special events throughout the school year and even over the summer. You have, you know, Thanksgiving plays, you have Christ-- holiday plays, you have various different parent/teacher conferences, meetings going on, fairs going on. It's almost a weekly thing that you're going to have a special event going on.

This isn't something where we only need it once or twice a year. We're going to be needing it regularly. So as I've said, we are asking that we -- instead of expanding the landscaping requirement inside of the parking, we've broken up the lots so that it's not one big sea of parking. We've put in other measures.

We have a lot of green space left over and we have a lot of wooded areas left over. We're keeping the parking lots away from the property lines. I think the plan that we have presented to you meets the intent of that 20 percent landscaping requirement that you would see for 100 to 200 percent. It may not be the way that is envisioned under the Code, but what I would say to that is if it's a problem with the Code, then we can rewrite the Code.

But as the Code applies today, that 20 percent landscaping requirement is not a requirement for what we are asking. We would like you to apply the 10 percent to our variance.

MR. CLITHERO: Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: I would like to also add that it was put into the Code as it was indicated to go up from 10 to 20 percent primarily for two reasons. Number one, to reduce the impact -- and I think we have discussed that and how by adding additional landscaping, it can actually increase the impact by adding additional impervious surface.

I've done some quick calculations, and adding an additional 10 percent will actually add at least 6,000 square foot of additional pavement impervious surface. And as Mr. Clark pointed out, he counted up the 11 islands. Those are the internal islands. Keep in mind too that you've got all the half islands that are on all the exterior that you see on there. That's all part of the 10 percent too, so that will have to be added too.

So it's kind of the snowball effect of trying to get up to 20 percent, and you're trying to get up to 20 percent of the amount of parking. So as you add islands, you increase the amount of pavement, so your 20 percent number increases. So you're chasing this

number as you continue.

I've done this many times on -- even tried to get 10 percent on certain projects, and so it is frustrating to try to do that. And another -- and CPS has felt that that is adequately addressed through their other measures that they have done. They did pay a premium for this land, and to set aside 35 percent that they are not going to touch is costing the district money right there.

They paid for that land and now they are not going to touch it. That is a huge financial burden that they have already acquired for this. And with the additional things that we have discussed too, how much do they have to mitigate for these impacts? So how much is enough?

And the other -- and the other reason for the going from 10 to 20 percent as Pat alluded to is it has a disincentive to simply try and keep -- try and keep people from just building as much parking as they want. I would argue that there is also disincentive there. Building parking, whether it is two lots or 425 is expensive.

You've got asphalt, base rock, concrete, curb and gutter, required landscaping, whether it be 10, 20, 30, 40 percent. This all quickly adds up to hundreds of thousands of dollars. So that is already a disincentive, but CPS has considered all of this and, yes, adding going up to 20 percent will be an over \$100,000 impact.

And even going to 425, they already have additional costs just by simply building the parking as we're showing above and beyond what is required. CPS has looked at that and considered it. They simply will not sacrifice on safety, so that is why they are requesting this amount for safety considerations. I also want to bring up going back to that 29-4.3(e), and I believe Mr. Clark mentioned it, (ii) mentions the development site landscaped area is not to be reduced to less than 15 percent. With the layout that you have been shown right there, the site has 85 percent green space maintained. So that is by far above and beyond exceeded, so again, another mitigation to consider there.

So I just wanted to help point out those -- those items. Thank you.

MR. CLITHERO: Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. CLITHERO: Okay. Any thought?

MR. CALDERA: I would respectfully remind the Board to speak in the microphone.

MS. HAMMEN: I move we approve the variance as accepted -- as requested.

MR. CLITHERO: With 425 parking spaces. I second that.

MR. CLARK: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

MR. CLITHERO: She made a motion to approve the request as submitted for 425 parking spaces. I seconded that. Any --

MR. CLARK: Well, I'll make one or two comments.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay.

MR. CLARK: It follows Code laws. I buy these arguments. I've had a lot to do with the schools over the years through neighbors associations, and the Columbia Public Schools have gone out of their way to make their facilities available not just for school events, but for all kinds of things. Then as a result, everything is all booked all the time. So this notion of having a need for peak parking for these various kind of things not only just benefits the kids who are going to school there, but this is just a good pattern to continue in this direction. So I plan to support the motion.

MR. CLITHERO: Thank you. Pat, would you call the roll?

MR. CALDERA: Actually, Mr. Chair, just to clarify, a fellow board member did ask a question and I want to make sure that the record reflects it.

MR. CLITHERO: Okay.

MR. CALDERA: The question was in terms of the motion, the motion was to approve the request as submitted by the applicant for 425 spots, not to add any additional conditions of 20 percent landscaping. It's as is. Okay. And that has been--

MR. HURLEY: That's how I understood it. Yeah.

MR. CALDERA: -- has been seconded by Mr. Clithero. Okay.

MR. HURLEY: Did I hear it?

MS. HAMMEN: Yes.

MR. HURLEY: Okay.

MR. CLITHERO: Now are you ready to call the roll?

MR. ZENNER: I'm ready to call the roll. I want to make sure you are all done talking. A motion has been made and seconded to approve the requested variance to allow onsite parking to exceed the 200 percent so as to permit 425 parking spaces to be constructed on property addressed as 5550 South Sinclair Road as depicted generally on Exhibit 3. Mr. Hurley?

MR. HURLEY: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Clithero?

MR. CLITHERO: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Clark?

MR. CLARK: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: Ms. Hammen?

MS. HAMMEN: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Waters?

MR. WATERS: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: Five votes in favor. Motion passes. Variance granted.

Approve the requested variance to allow onsite parking to exceed the 200 percent so as to permit 425 parking spaces to be constructed on property addressed as 5550 South Sinclair Road as depicted generally on Exhibit 3.

Yes: 5 - Hammen, Clithero, Hurley, Waters and Clark

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VII. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. CLITHERO: There you go. Do we have any other business, Pat?

MR. ZENNER: It does not appear as though we do, sir. We have not yet received applications for your next Board of Adjustment meeting. We will have those, I believe, on April 2. We'll have the next application submission deadline, which will be the end of March. So we have to stay tuned to find out if you'll have additional information. That is all we have to offer this evening.

VIII. BOARD COMMENTS

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE - April 10, 2018 @ 7 pm (tentative)

X. ADJOURNMENT

MR. CLITHERO: I move to adjourn.

MS. HAMMEN: Second.

MR. CLITHERO: We're all in favor.

(Off the record.)

(The meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.)

Motion to adjourn