



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 7, 2021
7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Council Chambers
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. LOE: I'm going to call the January 7, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order.

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

MS. CARROLL: We have nine members present; we have a quorum.

MS. LOE: We have a full quorum.

Present: 9 - Tootie Burns, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Lee Russell, Anthony Stanton, Brian Toohey, Michael MacMann, Valerie Carroll and Sharon Geuea Jones

II. INTRODUCTIONS

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner, are there any adjustments or additions to the agenda?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, ma'am.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: I move to approve the agenda.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

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

Ms. Rushing's thumb is up.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: We have unanimous.

MS. RUSHING: Oh. It was all put down here.

MS. LOE: It's the wall. The wall was hiding your thumb there.

Approved Agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 10, 2020 Regular Meeting

MS. LOE: Everyone should have received a copy of the December 10th meeting minutes. Were there any additions, changes, edits?

MR. STANTON: I move to approve.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Geuea Jones. I'll take a thumbs up approval on the minutes.

(Six votes for approval; one abstention.)

MS. LOE: One -- you were -- we have one abstention. Ms. Russell.

Approved Minutes.

V. TABLING REQUESTS

Case # 46-2021

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of the Columbia Housing Authority (owners), for approval of a major amendment to the, "Kinney Pointe PD Plan" and the associated statement of intent governing the 1.96-acre property located at the northeast corner of Sexton Road and Garth Avenue. The revised PD plan proposes 24 multi-family units in a mix of 2, 3, & 4 bedrooms on the site with a total density of 12.23 units per acre. **(The applicant has requested that this item be tabled to the January 21, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting).**

MS. LOE: All right. That brings us to our first case of the evening, which is a tabling request.

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

MR. PALMER: We actually don't have one prepared due to the tabling request.

MS. LOE: All right. Usually -

MR. PALMER: I can give you the reason for their tabling --

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. PALMER: -- is just due to scheduling issues over the holidays and some minor design issues that needed to be worked out.

MS. LOE: All right. And they should be prepared by January 21st?

MR. PALMER: Yes. That was their requested date, so -

MS. LOE: All right. Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I'm just going to go right to it. I move to table Case 46-2021 to the January 21st, 2021 Planning and Zoning meeting.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. MacMann. We have a motion on the floor. Mr. Zenner, I just want to confirm this was advertised as tabling and wasn't advertised as a public hearing?

MR. ZENNER: The advertising for the case was advertised as a public hearing for this evening. The agenda, as posted, was posted with the tabling notification.

MS. LOE: All right. So we're okay with moving ahead without any --

MR. ZENNER: If there is any individual --

MS. LOE: -- public --

MR. ZENNER: -- in the audience that you would like to address the Commission as it relates to this, as has been historic practice, you can invite them to podium so those comments may be captured for the record as it relates to this, but we are only discussing the aspect of the tabling, not the merits of the case.

MS. LOE: I'm going to poll the audience before we make a vote -- take a vote on this. Is there anyone here to speak on this case in the audience? Okay. Seeing none. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Indirectly, a little bit of point of order here. I understand that the local neighborhood does want more time to evaluate this because of the issues with Covid and meetings and stuff like that, and I did send back to them that it was planned to be tabled.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: Just so everyone is on the up and up there.

MS. LOE: Any additional discussion? Seeing none. Ms. Carroll, may we have a roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing. Motion carried 9-0.

MS. CARROLL: Nine votes to approve; the motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for tabling will be made.

Move to table Case 46-2021 to the January 21st, 2021 Planning and Zoning meeting

Yes: 9 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, MacMann, Carroll and Geuea Jones

VI. SUBDIVISIONS

Case # 35-2021

A request by Engineering Surveys & Services (agent), on behalf of Leon and Marilyn Keller Properties LLC (owner), for a two-lot preliminary plat to be known as "Preliminary Plat Northland Acres Plat 3". The 1.98-acre property is zoned IG (Industrial) and is addressed 3206 Range Line Street.

MS. LOE: That brings us to our next case for this evening under Subdivisions.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat, "Preliminary Plat Northland Acres Plat 3".

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Before we move to questions for staff, I would like

to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to this meeting to please share that with the Commission now so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information related to this case. Seeing none. Is there any -- are there any questions for staff? I see none. In that case, we will open the floor up to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: Speakers should give their name and address for the public record. You will have three minutes to speak. If you're speaking for group, you can have six minutes.

MR. NOVAK: Hi. My name is Jacob Novak, and I work with Engineering Surveys & Services at 1113 Fay Street here in Columbia, Missouri, just right over the hill. Tonight, we're representing Marilyn and Leon Keller. They are the -- I didn't know if you knew this, but they are the owners of Meyer Electric, and their hope is to develop the lot as a small office -- a forward office. They're located in Jeff City and want to have a forward office here. If you've driven by the lot, it's currently being renovated -- the building, which didn't necessary require the plat. Their two goals were to bring the lot into conformance with the City UDC, as well as they have a septic tank sitting behind there, and the hope was to bring public gravity sewer to their lot so they could, you know, get rid of the septic tank. They're not the funnest things to take care of. So that's why we're doing the plat. And I came tonight to see if you guys had any questions for Engineering Surveys & Services, or we also have an owner representative here tonight if you wanted to ask them any questions. That's all I've got. Thank you for your time.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Novak. Are there any questions for this speaker? Good job.

MR. NOVAK: Awesome.

MS. LOE: All right.

MR. NOVAK: Thank you and have a nice night.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any other speakers on this case? If not, we will close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I would entertain a motion, Madam Chair. As it relates to Case 35-2021, Northland Acres Plat 3, preliminary plat, I move to approve the preliminary plat of "Preliminary Plat Northland Acres Plat 3".

MS. RUSSELL: I'll second that.

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

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

Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing. Motion carries 9-0.

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

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

Move to approve the preliminary plat of "Preliminary Plat Northland Acres Plat 3".

Yes: 9 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, MacMann, Carroll and Geuea Jones

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND SUBDIVISIONS

Case # 37-2021

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of McNary Properties, LLC (owner), to rezone 5.92-acres from PD (Planned District) to R-1 (One-Family Residential). The subject property is located at southeast terminus of Scarborough Drive and is presently undeveloped. The applicant is seeking to develop the subject acreage into 7 single-family lots.

MS. LOE: This brings us to public hearings and subdivisions.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning from PD to R-1.

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Palmer, what's the slope on this property?

MR. PALMER: Obviously, that depends on where you're talking about, but generally, it slopes down towards the center of the site going west -- or east to west and down towards the -- the more wooded area on the west end, but it's -- it's fairly steep.

MR. MACMANN: Do you know the pitch on that?

MR. PALMER: No, I don't. It obviously varies across the site, but -

MR. MACMANN: We have a pitch standard, don't we, for steep slopes here in the city?

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: That's -- Mr. Zenner, you may know. We changed that. Is it 15 or

20? We wanted 15, and I lost that vote. It's 20 now. Right?

MR. ZENNER: Twenty or twenty-five.

MR. MACMANN: With caveats. Correct?

MR. ZENNER: I believe that is correct.

MR. MACMANN: All right. And we don't know what this slope is?

MR. ZENNER: I mean, from a steep slopes perspective, that would be handled more at the aspect of the subdivision infrastructure design perspective to ensure it would be preserved.

MR. MACMANN: I appreciate it's a building-site issue rather than a land-use issue necessarily, but I want to bring that up here because it -- we're dropping, what, 20-plus feet over that, something like that? Let me just -- I will move on and won't belabor this point. I'm concerned about the slope. Thank you, Mr. Palmer.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: If you go to the -- the old plat on the -- where, approximately, are these seven lots going to be?

MR. PALMER: We'll get into that in the next case.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. PALMER: But, generally, where the loop street is, in place of this and probably more towards this intersection here is the -- the design we have at this point shows a turn-around at that location, and all of those lots are centered off of that turn-around.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Mr. Palmer, this is perhaps more of a comment than a question, but I found the logic used in this report interesting in conjunction with a case we had the end of last year, which was Case 201-2020 for Northridge PD Plan. And the staff recommended approving that proposal, and the arguments for supporting it included promoting mixed housing options and encouraging integrated residential densification. Tonight we're having a proposal brought before us and staff is encouraging us to support it for reasons including that the plan previously included housing types not permitted in R-1, so we're being encouraged to go away from mixed housing options and go more toward a straight single-family, and that it will decrease density. So I just wanted to point out that I'm finding staff's logic a bit circular, if not inconsistent, and a bit hard to follow, so --

MR. PALMER: I mean, that could be just the difference in staff that prepared the two reports.

MS. LOE: I -- I agree, but if -- pretty diametric, so I think we might need to have further conversations if that's going to be the case.

MR. ZENNER: What I would suggest to you, Ms. Loe, is if you look at the development pattern that is outside of the Cambridge Place PD -

MS. LOE: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: -- to the west of this particular -- or to the east of this particular project, which is shown on the map, Hilda, as well as Meadowview Drive, those are standard single-family detached homes in straight-zoned property.

MS. LOE: Correct.

MR. ZENNER: The objective of the developer as a part of the Cambridge Place PUD was to have individual postage stamp sized lots that were more in a condo-style regime with common area that surrounded them. Market conditions have changed over time as this development has built out. This particular property, and the applicant's representative is here to explain maybe more about how this property has not -- has been released, in essence, from the original covenant that was associated with this development parcel, and they are looking to move toward a more consistent form of development. Now while it may seem to be contrary to what we have done with the Northridge project, which was 201, we have mixed-use project in this area. We have an opportunity for that, and it was a combination of duplexes and single-family attached -- or single-family detached homes in this -- in the Cambridge Place. This particular development is just eliminating the -- the duplex, which is not possibly being seen as viable in this particular location, whereas creating density within the particular area of the prior case and utilizing the planned district approach to do that versus going into an R-2 zoning classification to yield cottage-style sized lots, there is a difference here in that respect. I mean, we had R-1 lots surrounding the -- the prior case, as well, and we could have utilized that as a justification for it to remain R-1. We chose not to, looking at what the other infrastructure aspects were -- public infrastructure aspects -- schools, parks, and the like. This is far more remotely located in an area at the back of an existing development. And the conversion to single-family -- solely single-family lots that are going to be relatively large single-family lots, significantly less dense, to some extent addresses the comment that Mr. MacMann is making as it relates to the topographical issues here. It is a more responsible approach to deal with what, from what I am looking at here now, Mr. MacMann is a topo map that we had within the packet, approximately a 40 to -- 30 to -- 30-foot fall on this property from east to west, coming down to the creek, which, basically, is in the back of two proposed lots, which Mr. Palmer will get to here with the subdivision plan, probably a much more responsible approach to development than enhancing the development intensity. The packaging of how we may have described this and our logic could have been better. However, we don't believe that the reduction in the

density in this particular instance is inappropriate. It actually may be more appropriate given the environmental impacts.

MS. LOE: I -- and I would encourage you to use the site-specific instances to support the arguments or the report in the future. Again, as I read it, for me, anyway, as one of the Commissioners, it weakens both arguments when I don't get that information and I'm simply being told in one case, we're encouraging densification, and I'm being told in another case we're supporting downzoning. So fully understand. I would say, though, in this case, given that there are duplexes immediately to the north in the PUD, and that there's R-2 zoned immediately on the north border of the PD, that if the developer has some information telling us that those duplexes aren't successful and this is the reason why they no longer -- this is the market reason why they no longer want to move forward with more of those, that would mean more to me than saying they want to now be more analogous to the properties to the south of them because, again, we just looked at a project where it was completely surrounded by R-1, and we approved upzoning with a reduced area for print, so completely no adjacencies. I would just -- we do read the reports, and I would appreciate more specific information. Any additional comments or questions? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I had the same question you did. As a matter of fact, I wrote densification with a question mark. But when I went out and drove through that area, it's pretty -- even though it's single-family and duplexes, it's pretty densely developed. And this area where these units are proposed is wooded and I just think that reducing the number of units that go down there takes some of the stress off of that area environmentally, and given the overall densification in that area -- in the rest of the area, I think that this is probably appropriate, particularly given the topographical issues that they're going to have to deal with on the property. But I agree that just reading the staff report, that's -- was not obvious. And I think that it would be helpful when they say -- make one recommendation here and another there, that they do a little bit more to explain the difference between the properties.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: This is maybe more appropriate for the owners/developer, but my -- my concern is maybe somewhere to something you touched on, which is we've got really dense duplexes, condos, whatever you want to call them, with a community center. And I think -- I know at least part of Juniper is more of a senior community kind of area. I don't know if this is near that part of Juniper or not, but -- but we've got all this density and community style living, and then we're going to have these huge lots with single-family homes on it, and that seems out of character for the rest of the neighborhood. And I'm

just wondering, am I understanding what they're trying to do correctly. Like, is -- is this going to be -- because even though there's R-1 that back to this, those R-1 lots are teeny tiny, you know. They're -- they're not big R-1 lots; they're very small. So I'm just wondering if this is going to be way out of character with everything else. And are you -- Rusty, you could tell me that's the developer's question and you don't know.

MR. PALMER: Oh. I mean, like I said in the report, you're basically just -- you are getting larger lots. You're still single-family in nature, you're just removing the attached option, basically. But probably the larger lots is the biggest impact as far as, you know, what you're going to see on the site when you drive in there. It'll be an obvious character difference, but also from a planning perspective, as

Mr. Zenner noted, this is where you would see those larger lots, at the rear of development, at the end of that cul-de-sac road. So, you know, my opinion is that it's -- it's appropriate to lessen the density in this location, at least.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

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

MS. CARROLL: I was considering saving this for Commissioner discussion, but since we're on the topic now. I'm thankful that you brought up this comment, Sara. I noticed the same thing when I was driving it, and I also noted several duplexes in the same development. My concern was to the message that we're sending when we tell the community that we support just densification in one area and then send a contradictory message in the other area. Our concerns for social mobility are just as relevant in one neighborhood as they are in another neighborhood. That said, I don't have a problem with this particular project. I -- I just want us to give some thought to this.

MS. LOE: All right. If we don't have any additional questions for staff, we will move on to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: And, again, if you come up to the podium, if you can give your name and address for the record.

MR. MURPHY: Madam Chairman, Commissioners, my name is Kevin Murphy. I'm with A Civil Group, offices at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. I'll just freshen your minds and what the discussion we're just having, I would agree with staff and also Commissioner Rushing. Density has its appropriate place. There's plenty of times where I have brought projects to here and we get shot down, pushed away, told to come back with another plan that's not as dense. I don't know, if you're down Rock Quarry Road or here, it's a narrow, two-lane road that has quite a bit of traffic on it. So infrastructure is -- is lacking for full densification in this area. Also the environmental concerns, the slopes

you were considering, I believe, are just -- are small maps, and I can't see so well anymore, but it looks like it's 10 to 15 percent slope on there. That's not -- that's not horribly steep. But more of that ground and more of those trees are going to be able to be preserved. Again, it's less traffic going through those folks that have lived out there for 20 years. We're -- densitywise, we're a fifth of the density to that. I would also say that this is a different mix of housing out here, whether it be a single-family, and again pointing out the smaller single-family lots to the south and to the east, the mixed neighborhood within Cambridge Place that, instead of having not only the use and single-family or two-family, we have big lots, which is different than the surrounding area. So -- so in my mind, that's a variety of housing and property types that are allowed. There's additionally to the north, there's plenty of duplexes to the north of Cambridge Place and up to -- to Nifong there. Again, yes, we're going -- we're going from 29 units to seven units, 19 buildings to seven buildings. We're retaining a tree preservation area and -- and, actually, the contract purchaser for this property plans to build their own residence on the large lot to -- to the south and west, and potentially a house for his mother in the neighborhood, as well. Oh, well, I guess that's just a zoning point, so I can't talk about some -- the preliminary plat a bit later, but I think that's all I have for now. If you have any questions --

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Murphy. Are there any questions for this speaker? Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Hi. Thank you. I -- I think I see better what you're trying to do, but are these going to be extremely out of character, very large lots next to tiny houses and attached single family? Like, that -- that would be my only concern, that this turns into a neighborhood I lived in for a while here in Columbia, had one remaining corner lot that had, I think, a 6,000-square-foot home on it, and everything else was 1,500 square feet. Like, that -- that's -- I don't think that works well for any of the neighbors. That's what I'm trying to figure out.

MR. MURPHY: Well, I don't -- I'm not understanding, I guess, why you wouldn't think that's well -- works out well or not. Does somebody feel inadequate because their house is smaller?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. Yeah. That was it. No. It's that you have -- when you have -- it starts messing with home values and eventually, like, the person who owned that corner lot confided in me that he ended up very upside down in that house because as the rest of everything was developed, his house -- he could never get that money back because the neighborhood was -- all of the comps were so much lower than his house.

MR. MURPHY: I can see that. Again, this property is not part -- the Cambridge Place has other things to offer that people would have. They have a large -

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, so this would be completely out of this then?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. MURPHY: They have a large club house and -- you know, many amenities and whatnot that people buy in there for that reason, but -- yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. I wasn't understanding that. For some reason, it wasn't clicking in my head. I appreciate that.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker?

MR. MURPHY: I'm sorry. I would -- I do think you would hear -- you may hear from some of the neighbors possibly in that neighborhood that they've enjoyed this ground big and open and empty. And -- and I -- you know, I would hope they would like that it is being down, so less -- less development than what could be done currently and more impactful on the -- on the property.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, and if I'm looking -- I peeked. But if I'm looking right, a good portion of it is tree preservation lot?

MR. MURPHY: Yes. On the -- on the very west end, yes. There's a good portion there. And, again, on the large lot, the contract purchaser is going to build on that, and he intends to -- to save -- he currently has a house out west of town that looks out onto six acres of, you know, unimproved ground, and that's what he would -- intends to enjoy here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any more questions for this speaker? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Sure. Thank you, folks.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case? If there's none, we'll close public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: You brought up some good points, and I want to advise my colleagues that one size doesn't fit all all the time, and that's basically why we're here as a Commission to make those 50-50 calls and make those space and time and neighborhood appropriate decisions. As you well know, I'm involved in a lot of affordable housing and we deal with density in inner cities and all that kind of stuff. And we -- what was brought up was mobility and house mobility and availability. This project fits all that. Not only does it have the diverse housing stock, but the developer did decrease the footprint. It did preserve more green space, and it diversified the housing stock because

now not only do you have short, smaller lots, you've got bigger lots and -- you know, if we want to talk about the social impact that is, hey, there's different types of houses and there will be different types of families and some people have got big yards that we can go play in, and then people have got smaller yards. And all of that is good in the -- in the neighborhood. So even though those arguments were very, you know, very poignant, diversity in housing stock and density works both ways. It can be less dense, it could be more dense. And I'm always in support of the downsizing because in our past we've dealt with, you know, places where they downsized to protect the neighborhood, and this is definitely could be a way to protect and preserve a particular part of this neighborhood by making it less dense and making in R-1 and not a PUD where he had a lot more latitude to do a lot more stuff that we probably would complain about later. So as we have these discussions, you know, those -- those things work both ways. And I plan to support this, if you didn't know.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann? Sorry.

MR. MACMANN: Although I do believe I was up before Valerie does --

MS. LOE: Ms. Carroll?

MR. MACMANN: -- I was going to make a motion. I think she has a comment.

MS. CARROLL: I also plan on supporting this. I think the project is a good project. I think it fits the neighborhood, but I do think it -- I agree, one size does not fit all. One statement doesn't fit all, and it's the statements that I'm concerned with. It's the message that we're sending. Supporting this project is easy to do. Support downzoning, support densification, that's a little heavier of a statement. And like Sara mentioned, I think that warrants some discussion and some consideration because it communicates a desire of the City that relates to a number of other projects.

MS. LOE: Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: For the most part, Cambridge Place is a senior community, so it offers things for seniors there, so I don't think there's -- they're going to have a problem with the sizes of -- of lots there. They might miss being able to walk out in the woods, but -- but they have a lot of other things going on there, so I plan to support it.

MS. LOE: Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, and I think, for some reason during the staff report, when they said taking it out of the Cambridge Place, I thought they meant the PD plan, not that it's not part of the Cambridge Place what's -- HOA, or whatever their agreement is for the community center and the senior living. And part of my concern was just a giant lot is not necessarily desirable or good for a senior -- someone who wants to move to a senior living community anyway, but I -- I think I understand this better now and I think I'll

probably support it.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If no one else -- in the matter of Case 37-2021, McNary Properties, LLC, rezoning from PD to R-1, I move to approve.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

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

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

Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing. Motion carries 9-0.

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

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

Move to approve rezoning from PD to R-1.

Yes: 9 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, MacMann, Carroll and Geuea Jones

Case # 38-2021

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of McNary Properties, LLC (owners), for approval of an 8-lot preliminary plat on 5.92-acres located at the terminus of Scarborough Drive. A concurrent request (Case # 37-2021) to rezone the subject property from PD (Planned District) to R-1 (One-Family Residential) is also under consideration.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat subject to minor technical corrections.

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

MR. MACMANN: I have a question and it might be for Mr. Zenner, it might be for staff or for our staff attorney. When we make this motion, as all the details are not ironed out, does it have to be a conditional motion? Do we have to word that in some special way to cover the turn-around, or what's the story there?

MR. ZENNER: I would recommend that the motion be made subject to technical corrections.

MR. MACMANN: Like resolution of the technical issue of the turn-around. All right. I just want to make sure that we were worded correctly so everyone gets what they need.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you, sir.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Mr. Palmer, I have a question. The maintenance access easement, would the neighbors be able to use that to access the --

MR. PALMER: Yeah. It's -- it's private property, but it's there. It's an easement across private property to grant access to that tree preservation area. As far as I know, there is no plan to, like, put a trail through there because of a lot of it is encumbered by the -- the drainage channel, so improvement in it might not be feasible or desirable even, but it will be used to -- to access the tree preservation area for the minimal amount of maintenance that it would require.

MS. LOE: Thank you. If there's no additional questions for staff, we will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

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

MR. MURPHY: Hello, again. Kevin Murphy, A Civil Group, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. In developing this plan, it became aware of us -- to us that in the last few -- several months, the fire department has been requiring larger sized cul-de-sac bulbs. Typical would be a 76-foot diameter. The IFC Code -- the International Fire Code stipulates a 96-foot. They've -- starting -- started to adhere to that. The conflict is the UDC still does not recognize that. But then back to the IFC, they have not only a regular cul-de-sac bulb, they have several other different options for allowing appropriate turn-around and access for fire trucks. We picked this one. It's just the least amount of pavement, least amount of impact on -- on the environment. We feel at the end of this cul-de-sac, that really you're going to see the houses. You're going to figure out what you've got to do if somebody inadvertently comes down here. Mainly, the people that come down here are the people that live down there. The idea would be on the west end of the T going into that larger lot, there would be signage there definitely noting that it was a private drive, and they would do what they need to do. Again, that would be the -- the contract purchaser/developer's own lot, so he's not concerned with it. The fire department is happy with this type of turn-around. I think the traffic division was okay with it. Planning was -- seemed to be okay with it. I just think it was a -- a single person has got a hiccup in their head that it doesn't quite meet the UDC's standard, because, again, they're just showing in the UDC your typical round bulb. But, again, not a high-traffic area, and -- and we feel that that would work well in this instance without putting down a ton more pavement and concrete and whatnot.

MS. LOE: So the turn-around is the only technical issue?

MR. PALMER: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS. LOE: Yeah. Okay. Any questions for Mr. Murphy? I see none. Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none. Come on up.

MR. BOEHM: I didn't plan on speaking, but since there's been a couple of questions about Cambridge. My name is Randy Boehm, and I live at 4158 Juniper Place. Our property actually backs up onto this piece of property. I'm currently the president of the Cambridge Place Neighborhood Association. We don't have any official position because we did not take a vote. But I will tell you that the board did meet and talk about this. Also talked to Mr. Wilson at some extent. And we -- although I can't tell you there's complete consensus -- I don't know if that every happens these days -- there are certainly members of our group who would like to see it not be developed, but we don't really think that that's possible. So looking at the fact that it will ultimately be developed in some fashion, we think that this proposal is best for all involved and we trust and like Mr. Wilson's plan, and so I can tell you that the majority of the Cambridge folks are in agreement with this plan. And I will say that in conversation with Mr. Wilson, he does not have any plans of asking to become part of our neighborhood association. He thinks that we already have enough people using our facilities and we agree with that. Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you. Any additional speakers? Seeing none, we'll close public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: If my colleagues don't have any other discussion, I would like to entertain a motion, ma'am. As it relates to Case 38-2021, Cambridge Place Phase 4 Preliminary Plat, I move to approve the Phase 4 Preliminary Plat pursuant to minor technical revisions in relation to the final turn-around layout to be coordinated with staff with the applicant.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. MacMann. I can't see anyone's mouth.

MR. MACMANN: Second. Two. I say two.

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

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

Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing. Motion carries 9-0.

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

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

MS. LOE: That brings us to Public Hearings and our last case for the evening.

Move to approve the Phase 4 Preliminary Plat pursuant to minor technical revisions in relation to the final turn-around layout to be coordinated between staff and the applicant.

Yes: 9 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, MacMann, Carroll and Geuea Jones

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 45-2021

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Walters Acquisitions, Inc. (owner), for a PD plan amendment to the *Columbia Plaza South PD Plan* to accommodate the redevelopment of the site as a Culver's restaurant with an accessory drive-through, and a design exception to 29-4.3(i)(2)(iii) to allow a service window on the corner side of a building. The approximately 0.77-acre property is located at the southeast corner of Stadium Boulevard and Bernadette Drive, and includes the address 2010 Bernadette Drive.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested PD Plan to be known as Columbia Plaza South PD Plan and the associated design exception to Section 29-4.3(i)(2)(iii).

MS. LOE: Thank you. Before we move on to staff questions, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to the meeting to please share that with the Commission now so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on the case in front of us. Seeing none. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a question for Planner Smith. When we make this motion, it'll be two motions?

MR. SMITH: No. I don't think in this situation.

MR. MACMANN: I mean, one for the window and one for the design exception?

MR. SMITH: Well, we usually do for the design adjustments, but, in this case, because the design exception, I think, is part of the plan, I think it would be -

MR. MACMANN: And that's why I asked that question. We often have a second for a design exception. When the motion is stated, the agreement building butt [sic] out or whatever we're going to call it should be in that motion. Correct?

MR. SMITH: I think so.

MR. ZENNER: That would be correct.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. Last question for -- for right now. I notice that the screening, there's a sign on that. Are we going to run into sign -- extra signage issues?

MR. ZENNER: The -- so signage is based upon on wall area.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. We're good.

MR. ZENNER: We will be fine, yeah.

MR. MACMANN: All right. That's all I want to know. I just wanted -- we weren't getting into another issue by bringing that out.

MR. ZENNER: I understand.

MR. MACMANN: I'm good. Thanks.

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

MS. RUSHING: I was kind of concerned, although probably not overly so, about the loss of parking. How many total parking spaces are going to be lost with this?

MR. SMITH: How many are going to be lost? I could check. They're going to be losing spaces. I can tell you that they need the minimum amount of spaces required for that site now. They also have a shared parking agreement with the bank lot to the east.

MS. RUSHING: So these parking spaces along the side are sufficient for that restaurant?

MR. SMITH: Yes. They have 21 space requirement, and they have along the east side, but they also have a small bank on the south side, if you can see those. So there's another -

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. SMITH: -- eight or nine spaces along the south property line. So they do meet the minimum, which I think is 21 on this site.

MS. RUSHING: Okay. I -- I'm down the -- down there quite a bit, and I don't see any other way that they could do this that would allow good traffic flow other than what they're proposing.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Mr. Smith, I have a question. Since this is a PD plan, how -- is -- is the screening described or is there a minimum requirement for the screening, because I notice that what is shown in the plan appears to be smaller than what's represented in the elevations.

MR. SMITH: Are you talking about the -- the drive-through screening?

MS. LOE: Yes.

MR. SMITH: The building?

MS. LOE: That's what they're asking -

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MS. LOE: -- indicating will be the exception. So the plan -- the screen appears to cover maybe one and a -- no -- go back to your screen, the plan you were on that shows the cars. Yeah. Stop.

MR. SMITH: All right.

MS. LOE: So using the car as a scale, maybe one and a half cars would fit behind that screened wall? Now, if you go to the front elevation. Next one. At least two full cars, maybe more.

MR. SMITH: And I could -- I could say that the elevations -- I spoke with the architect on this, and these were very early. They put these together kind of in a hurry just for this reason, that we had requested that they do something with screening these. So this was kind of their preliminary attempt.

MS. LOE: I understand, but asking us --

MR. SMITH: I don't know if they got the scale just right.

MS. LOE: -- to approve this based on elevations that don't represent what they intend to do, I think, is a little bit misguided.

MR. SMITH: I would say base it on what's on the plan. This is mostly just an illustration, so I apologize the scaling was off. So this is meant to really represent, I think, the design of it, and not so much the exact dimensions of it. So -

MS. LOE: So based on the plan, it appears the screen is about half the width of what's being shown in the elevation.

MR. SMITH: I think my objective would be to screen the service window, and that is the intent of that -- of the ordinance is not to have the service window there. So as long as that objective is met, then that was my intent with the screening.

MS. LOE: Right. But if the screen is only minimally wider than the service window, how much are you screening it, is my point?

MR. SMITH: It depends on what angle you're looking at it.

MS. LOE: Okay. Correct.

MR. SMITH: If you're considering a straight screening -

MS. LOE: If you're standing across the street from it, it's screened.

MR. SMITH: Right.

MS. LOE: If you're driving by it, you're seeing it.

MR. SMITH: Right. And the -- the alternative would be you want to see zero percent of it, in which case you're going to look at an extremely long wall, so there has to be somewhere in there where you do draw the line. And for me, it was -- it was pretty much going to be probably a little bit extra than -- than the window, but what we saw on the

plan for me was adequate. I think it was, like you said, a car and a half-length and to me, that -- that seemed to represent a fair amount of screening.

MS. LOE: Back to my original question. How do we know it's not going to get smaller or -- I mean, do we establish minimum requirements since what we've been presented with are inconsistent?

MR. SMITH: I would say that it -- what they construct should be -- should be -- match what's on this PD plan as far as length.

MS. LOE: On the plan. All right.

MR. SMITH: The design of it would be closer to what's on the architectural, whether it's one window or three windows. We've had some discussions with them, too, about the transparency of the windows because we did want to actually physically screen it, and so we talked to them about not making them transparent, but more translucent so that the light comes through, but not the visual appearance of the screening window. So I apologize if I -- if I've represented that that was a final version of an architectural plan. It was meant to be more of an illustration of what it probably will look like.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any additional questions for staff?

MR. ZENNER: Ms. Loe, what I would suggest, if there is concern amongst the Commissioners as it relates to the potential disconnect between the expectation of the architectural element, the location of it is what is shown and represented on the plan. Architecturally, if you want to ensure in your motion that the visual -- the visual aspects of seeing the window, the service window, you could potentially include some qualifying statements within that that it shall as closely as possible reflect the architectural design as depicted in the attached architectural elevation, and shall be designed such that the glass, if used, shall be translucent, not opaque and not fully transparent, allowing the applicant's architect and our staff some flexibility in which to ensure that the design meets that general expectation. I think that that may be where there may be some room for massaging what we see here that -- the architect's best attempt on short notice.

MS. LOE: The elevation, it does look part of the facade, but when it's reduced, I mean, especially in the angled perspective, it appears -- you know, it's about a third of the front elevation. So it carries off. I'm concerned when it gets reduced too much -- half of that, that it may lose that effect, but -- Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, and to your point, I think my concern -- while I am concerned about the width and whether it's an adequate screen, given what was just said about the windows, my new and much greater concern is it's going to end up being a wall. So rather than looking like a building and not a service window, it will look like a building with a blank wall; do you know what I mean? So it -- rather than looking like a

normal building, it's going to lose all architectural features and become a technical fulfillment of what we are passing today, which is an extension of the building that hides the service window, which is, I believe, all that we are requiring of them. We aren't requiring of them anything other than that in our exemption. Correct? Is that -

MR. SMITH: What was -- could you rephrase that again?

MS. GEUEA JONES: So if I -- if I am understanding the motion we will make, we will approve the PD plan with an exception to the appropriate portion of the UDC.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That exception is that they put a building extension that hides it from view of the street, and there are no requirements beyond that?

MR. SMITH: Correct. I mean, I think if I understand what you're saying, yeah, that the -- the physical screen is shown on the plan, so they will have to submit plans for that at the time when they come up with the building plans, and we would approve that based on the PD plan.

MR. ZENNER: And I think what our intention is, as we have discussed with the applicant up to this point, is that the architectural rendering that's been submitted is what that screening wall will look like, so it isn't integrated -- it is -- it looks integrated to the building. But I think the point that Mr. Smith is making and what I just suggested as a clarification to the opacity of these windows, is to address the issue that's underlying why the exception is being asked for. We're trying to ensure that the visibility of the drive -- the UDC is trying to ensure that the visibility of the drive-through window is actually not plainly visible. I mean, I think you could still design this architectural image with translucent windows and achieve what we want and still have it look as though it's part of the building.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. The fenestration is not going away.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, no. You can --

MR. SMITH: Like, the openings will be there. It will be, like, a frosted window or a glass-block window or something.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But there is no requirement that it be that. You're just saying

-

MR. ZENNER: Not unless -- not unless you, as the Commission, would like to make that a requirement, is what I'm suggesting. I think that -

MR. SMITH: Well, I have told them that's a requirement. I won't approve it unless -- unless I see that when the actual plans come in.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That -- that's kind of what I'm -

MR. SMITH: So -- and I'm leaving this a little bit to staff leeway that we have had that

conversation and that's going to be what they submit. And otherwise, it won't be approved. So it's a little hard to lock up this as the exact elevation.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

MR. SMITH: Because it isn't exact right now.

MS. GEUEA JONES: One more thing and then I'll yield.

MR. SMITH: Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I -- I would like either staff or legal to add to the motion that we eventually make that the -- the appropriate -- what do you call it -- shielding -- not shielding.

MS. LOE: Screening?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Screening. Thank you. That the appropriate screening is substantially similar to the elevation but use the phrase substantially similar.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Having bid on and built things like this, what is on that plan is the contract. And if it's not on that plan, I'm not going to build it. If you want me to build something else, you need to give me another plan to bid on. So the point here being, you know, we can all talk about -- whoever builds this is going to build what's on that plan. If you want something quite specific, I wouldn't get too crazy because the architects and staff still have to go through here. If we want something more specific, more effectively screening the window, a certain level of opacity, we need to call that out. Otherwise, it's not going to get there.

MS. LOE: Any additional comments, questions for staff? Seeing none. Let's open the floor for public discussion.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: Give your name and address for the record.

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. My name is Jay Gebhardt; I'm a civil engineer with A Civil Group, and I'm basically here to answer any questions you have.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Gebhardt. Any questions? I see none at this time. Thank you.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case? I see none. So we'll close public discussion for public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I have a quick comment, and then I'd like to entertain a motion.

MS. LOE: Let's make sure there aren't any other discussion items.

MR. STANTON: We always encourage innovation. This is very creative. This is a very creative method of dealing with a drive-through issue. Encourage this kind of stuff, and this is a heeded -- the call to address this issue, so I plan to support it.

MS. LOE: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I just wanted to thank Mr. Smith for going the extra mile to get additional views for us as to what this would be, and I trust in your statement that you will be making sure that the opacity or whatever it takes to screen the service window will occur. So thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional discussion? Mr. Stanton? Can we go back to the screen with the recommended -- there we go.

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, I would like to entertain a motion. As it relates to Case 45-2021, Columbia Plaza South PD Plan, minor -- major amendment, I move to approve the City -- the Columbia Plaza South PD Plan with the design exception to 29-4.3(i)(2)(iii) to allow a service window on the corner side of the building.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Russell. Mr. -- discussion on the motion. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I would like to amend that, if that's all right with you.

MS. LOE: Well, let's hear the amendment first.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. Yeah. I want to hear the amendment first.

MR. MACMANN: Oh, no. You've just got to take it. It's a yes or no thing. I think it's a philosophical point. I don't see any need for design exception for a drive-through, but we're here. So, therefore and thus, I want to capture and support in our quasi-judicial manner Planner Smith's agreement and support, and I think the best way to do that is to leave it to him to negotiate that with the applicant. And the best way to do that would be to add the following amendment -- to add a screen that substantially captures the architectural rendering. Planner Smith, does that allow you enough flexibility to do what you need to do?

MR. SMITH: I think that's fine.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Substantially screens.

MR. STANTON: I accept that, sir.

MR. MACMANN: Does the second accept that? Is that -

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MS. LOE: A second by Ms. Russell. Ms. Geuea Jones, you had some similar thoughts along those lines. Do you concur with -

MS. GEUEA JONES: I concur with the spirit of it. I -- how I was envisioning it being put was slightly different, but I think that what he is doing satisfies my concerns for sure.

MS. LOE: As do I. Any additional comments, discussion? Seeing none. Ms. Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

MR. TOOHEY: Wait. Can I clarify? So we need to be voting on the amendment before we vote on the motion. Correct?

MS. LOE: No. We're doing it as one.

MR. STANTON: I adopted it to my -

MS. RUSHING: We're voting on the amended motion.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. I adopted -

MS. LOE: Oh. They -- they -- he agreed, and she seconded it.

MR. STANTON: I accepted his additional language.

MR. TOOHEY: Right. But shouldn't we vote on the amendment before we then vote on the motion.

MR. MACMANN: I believe Mr. Toohey is correct, that it would resolve both the issues if we vote --

MS. RUSSELL: Actually, we changed the motion.

MR. MACMANN: Midstream?

MS. RUSSELL: Midstream. Right. So -

MS. LOE: We amended the motion.

MS. RUSSELL: Technically, we should have voted on the amendment --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Withdrawn.

MS. RUSSELL: -- and then voted on the amended motion, but we changed the motion midstream, so --

MR. MACMANN: I'm satisfied if you three are satisfied, you who made and seconded -

MR. STANTON: I accepted his language in my motion.

MR. MACMANN: That good with you, Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: It's fine. It's not really the way it should work parliamentary, but whatever you guys want to do.

MS. LOE: Well, we use quasi rules -- we're quasi-judicial and quasi -

MR. MACMANN: Quasi -

MS. GEUEA JONES: For the nerds, Mr. Stanton withdrew his motion, made a new motion, adopting the amendment that was seconded again.

MR. STANTON: I mean, yeah. If you want to do all that. I'm trying to avoid -- I'm to get it streamlined here, but if you want me to do that, I'll just restate it with his words in it.

MR. TOOHEY: Let's just vote on it and be done with it.

MS. RUSHING: I think we're good. I mean, that should be good.

MR. MACMANN: As long as that recorder has captured this exciting conversation, I think we're fine.

MR. ZENNER: Tantalizing. Just wait till we write the report.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Toohey. Good -- that was a good -

MR. ZENNER: We have an amended motion on the floor.

MS. LOE: We have an amended motion on the floor. And if we're in agreement, we're going to have -- ready to call to order. Ms. Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

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

Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing. Motion carries 9-0.

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

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

Move to approve the Columbia Plaza South PD Plan with the design exception to 29-4.3(i)(2)(iii) to allow a service window on the corner side of the building, subject to the addition of the drive-thru screening wall that is in substantial compliance with the submitted architectural rendering.

Yes: 9 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, MacMann, Carroll and Geuea Jones

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Seeing none.

X. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. ZENNER: Make sure I hit the button.

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Zenner, you have a five-second window.

MR. ZENNER: I know. All right. So it's been a month. I'm slow on the draw around here. So your next meeting is January 21. We do have a number of items on that agenda. If my Vanna can advance for me. We have Waco North, which was a preliminary plat that seems like it was eons ago that we tabled it to our December -- at our December 10 agenda. This is the extension of Waco Road north of the Tuscany development. We are still working through some technical issues associated with a development agreement that would accompany a future final plat. At this point, I'm 99 percent sure that we're going to have it on the agenda. However, we may get another request to table the road because of the preliminary plat on it, and I'll know more in the next week. The other item that we have is a public hearing for a subdivision that is a final plat out on the CHA's property. This is Trinity Place. It does have a design adjustment for an item that we are going to be dealing with under Item Number 49. It is a driveway crossing a property line; therefore, that's the design adjustment associated with Trinity

Place. We have tonight's tabled case for Kinney Pointe, that the One East Sexton, and then the UDC revisions. And as I think we have talked about previously, those UDC revisions, we will do that as a single staff report. However, we will ask that each of the amendments themselves have a separate vote on them, so we can partition the minutes accordingly. We won't bore you with 17 staff reports, one each amendment. Those are your items, and your locations, again. I'm sorry. Locations are Waco North project, the Trinity Place, and then Kinney Pointe, which is Sexton and Garth. And then this is our PD revision -- that's Kinney. So -- or I'm sorry. Yeah. Oak Tower. So those are our items. That's all we have for tonight. Thank you very much. Welcome back. Happy New Year. Maybe we'll be out of Covid protocols here shortly.

MS. LOE: Wishful thinking. You notice we all were unanimous -- I think it was all unanimous votes tonight. May we work in unison.

MR. ZENNER: And we did struggle to make sure we got there after staff had to explain.

MS. LOE: Well, discussion is okay. Right? We all pulled together in the end.

XI. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I'm going to steal a page from Commissioner Stanton here in a little bit. I encourage everyone to get vaccinated when they can. Along those lines, if the VA -- you guys should know the VA, the United States government by now. If the VA holds true, I will get vaccinated later this month. But I'm encouraging all of you to do that so we can stop doing this. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: I concur.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. I'd like a screen that -- so I don't have to have do this on my phone.

XII. NEXT MEETING DATE - January 21, 2021 @ 7 pm (tentative)

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

MS. RUSSELL: I move to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Oh, Ms. Russell, we have missed you.

MS. RUSSELL: You missed me.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. -- I'm going to give it to Stanton.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.)

(Off the record.)

Move to adjourn