



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 18, 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 November 18, 2021 Planning and Zoning meeting to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

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

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Burns.

MS. BURNS: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Rushing.

MS. RUSHING: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Present.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier.

MS. PLACIER: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell.

MS. KIMBELL: Here.

MS. CARROLL: I'm here. Commissioner Loe.

MS. LOE: Here.

MS. CARROLL: We have nine. We have a quorum.

Present: 9 - Tootie Burns, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Anthony Stanton, Michael MacMann, Valerie Carroll, Sharon Geuea Jones, Robbin Kimbell and Peggy Placier

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. LOE: Thank you. Mr. Zenner, are there any modifications or edits to the agenda?

MR. ZENNER: Not this evening.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Mr. MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. I'll take thumbs up approval on the agenda. Looks unanimous if Ms. Kimbell -- yep, unanimous.

(Unanimous thumbs-up vote to approve.)

Move to approve

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 4, 2021 Regular Meeting

MS. LOE: Everyone should have received a copy of the November 4 regular meeting minutes. Were there any changes or edits to those minutes?

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Mr. MacMann, seconded by Mr. Stanton. I'll take a thumbs up approval on those minutes. Ms. Placier, are you abstaining? Thumbs up. Okay. Unanimous. Thanks, everybody.

(Unanimous thumbs-up vote to approve.)

Move to approve

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 03-2022

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Wendling Development LLC (owner), for approval of a Planned Development (PD) Plan and associated Statement of Intent (SOI) for Lot 2 of Providence South Plaza, Plat 2 to permit a drive-through restaurant. The 1.29-acre Planned Development (PD) zoned property is addressed 511 E. Green Meadows Drive and is located on the northwest quadrant of the E. Green Meadows Road and Carter Lane roundabout.

MS. LOE: All right. That brings us to public hearings. Our first case for the evening is 03-2022, a request by Crockett Engineering on behalf of Wendling Development, LLC for approval of a planned development, PD, plan and associated statement of intent for Lot 2 of Providence South Plaza Plat 2 to permit a drive-through restaurant. The 1.29-acre planned development zoned property is addressed 511 East Green Meadows Drive and is located on the northwest quadrant of the East Green Meadows Road and the Carter Lane roundabout. May we have a staff report please.

Staff report was given by Ms. Rachel Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the PD, planned development, of Lot 2 of Providence South Plaza, Plate 2, and the associated statement of intent as required by the applicant.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Planner Smith. Before we move on to questions for staff, I'd like to ask any commissioner that had any ex parte prior to this case 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.

MS. RUSHING: I had contact from a citizen regarding the time of tonight's meeting, not indicating what the citizen was interested in. And I did provide that citizen with email copies of our agenda and the attachments.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any other ex parte? Seeing none, are there any questions for staff. Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Planner Smith, if you'll refer to the first locator map which was the overhead photograph, can you blow it up some?

MS. SMITH: This?

MR. MACMANN: That will work. The one in our packet is a little easier to see what I'm going to point out. I think you can see it on that one. Question, there is a flat space towards the top of the property and then there's a berm. Okay. In the center of that berm as it is traveling east is a cut in the berm, and that cut is -- has cattails in it and a variety of concrete piles is piled there. From the tracking, and I'll ask Mr. Crockett this also, it looks like it was an old well perhaps or an old storm sewer. I notice that there's no old storm sewer listed on this property and the sanitary sewer is south. Do we know anything about what could have been there or what is there?

MS. SMITH: No. I might defer to Mr. Crockett for that. It did not come up in the review process. There's no easement there by any means.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. I didn't see anything, and the storm sewers, storm collection points on Carter are not directly in line with that. So I didn't know what that was, but I was taking a look at it. All right. Thank you very much.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: I wonder from a staff perspective is there any reason to continue with a PP plan at this site as opposed to straight commercial?

MS. SMITH: So that came up during the concept review. Many of you might remember, we had a site on this piece of property that asked for MC zoning. With that -- down here.

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

MS. SMITH: Staff was not supportive of MC zoning. The Commission generally agreed with staff; I don't know what the exact vote was. And so that did not get rezoned out of PD. In terms of this site, there was discussion about maybe going to MN which would be generally supportable by staff for the existing zoning. The issue with the MN was going to be a two-step process because restaurants require a CP in the MN. And so we talked about the pros and cons of that. At that time we were still also kind of noodling out some site features that may have led to design exception request which did not end up happening. So we kind of went over process, and I don't -- even though this is typical to MC zoning, I don't know that we would go that far here. We'd have to think about that and evaluate that. And then potentially maybe, but then there would be the two-step process for the drive-through. So it was discussed. At this point I think the PD plan process does have some mechanisms in place that might be appropriate here.

MS. LOE: Ms. Placier.

MS. PLACIER: Yes. Between Macadoodles and this site as described, it looks like most of it will be under concrete in the building or the parking lot. Where will this -- well, first, is there any drainage evaluation on that. And also you said that about 38 percent would be open space. Are you just counting that as being the perimeter around all that pavement?

MS. SMITH: So the landscape plan is included. There -- yes. The site is subject to stormwater requirements, so all the impervious surfaces do have to be accounted for. I am not an engineer, I don't play one on TC, but yes, that is part of it. The site is more than an acre. It is absolutely subject to those requirements. In terms of the open space, which is typically going to be turf in this situation, and yes, that's typically going to mostly be on the perimeter. Right. Because this site has fewer than a hundred parking spots, so internal landscaping of the parking lot is not required, although, like I said, stormwater is. So PD plans at a minimum require 15 percent. The applicant through the SOI is requiring this site themselves, they're self-regulating to have 30 percent. They actually exceed that. If you look at the calculations on the landscaping plan, 38.7 percent will be open space. So that is accounted for on the landscaping plan.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none, we will open up the floor to public comment. If you can please give your name and address for the record.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. Ms. Smith did a very thorough job in the staff report I believe. She addressed many of the items that I would talk about tonight so I'll kind of forego that for the most part. But I would like to hit on a few topics. First of all, this property was zoned under the current zoning back in 2000. And I believe the

question was brought up with regard to looking at rezoning the property, and I think that we did look at that and we had some discussions about that, but also as part of the discussion, part of the rezoning back in 2000 was reducing some of the MC uses, or at that time C3 uses that wouldn't necessarily be appropriate at this location. I think that's where the planning department kind of came up, well, if we went with MC, we'd start allowing those uses back in and that may not be appropriate for the location. If it were MN and then it's a two-step process to get the zoning. If we don't get the drive-through, it's kind of a chicken and egg kind of thing. So I believe it's -- it was determined in this case keeping the PD zoning was the appropriate zoning. Again, it was zoned this back in 2000. And then Macadoodles to our west was developed, and again, when they developed, they added the two entrance points, one on the corner to the north and one on Green Meadows to the south. And that was designed, laid out to be a shared connection point. So we don't have a lot of connections and lot of driveways out on to Green Meadows and Carter Lane. However, we keep those controlled specified locations. Again, those are collector streets. They do handle -- are designed to and handle quite a bit of traffic, and certainly designed with this piece of property in mind as well. You know, Ms. Placier talked about the drainage at this location. Yes. The drainage is all addressed; there's no issues there. Generally it will drain from west to east. As Ms. Smith indicated we do have a detention cell located on the far east side. That handles our water quality component. So from the drainage calculation, on the drainage mainly we have to hit water quality and detention. This piece of property, just so happens, there's not many in town, this is one of them that is addressed by a regional detention basin. One is installed downstream that has this whole area. And so when that detention basin was designed and constructed, they had this piece of property as one of the areas in mind for commercial development. So all of that's been addressed. There's no concerns there. It's been reviewed by the City's stormwater engineers. And so that's how we're addressing it. So, yes, we do anticipate there's going to be water from Macadoodles coming across our property. We anticipate that into our design so there's no concerns. Again, the traffic for this site was reviewed by the City traffic engineers and I don't believe they have much concern either given the existing entrances. Again, there's no design adjustments, no design modifications. It conforms with the regulations that were established back in 2000. Furthermore, when the UDC came about in 2017, they put additional regulations, just broad regulations, you know, out there as well. This site complies with that I think as -- I almost said Ms. Bacon, sorry -- Ms. Smith identified all those locations with regards to the drive-through and those items as well. So those are some additional requirements that were put on this piece of property by the zoning

change and we're in conformance with those as well. Happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Any questions for Mr. Crockett?
Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Crockett, I'm going to ask you the question I asked Ms. Smith. There's a cut in that berm.

MR. CROCKETT: Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: There are cattails.

MR. CROCKETT: Yep.

MR. MACMANN: Water.

MR. CROCKETT: I meant to address that, Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: And yes. So what that is is when that site was originally graded, the developer put a diversion berm so that water just didn't kind of free flow out --

MR. MACMANN: I'm with you so far totally.

MR. CROCKETT: And what that does is that directs it down. And so that water has to discharge, so there's a rock check at the bottom of that I believe is what you're looking at.

MR. MACMANN: Is there a rock check at the top?

MR. CROCKETT: Another rock check --

MR. MACMANN: They need to use a rock check at the bottom, FYI.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: It's starting to erode.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. And so we will address that. You know, when this property develops, we're going to have to a full erosion control plan, so. I believe that's what you were looking for was the erosion control that the developer put in place many years ago to address that.

MR. MACMANN: I just -- I want to make sure that I knew what I was -- that's where I went first and then I was like, wow, okay. Then I'm thinking, okay, in 1985 what was on this property.

MR. CROCKETT: Right.

MR. MACMANN: Was there a house. Is this a well.

MR. CROCKETT: Right, no.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you though.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Any additional speakers on this case?

MS. LEE: Yes. I'm Marlene Lee. I live at 612 Huntridge in the Meadows Homeowners Association which overlooks -- from my kitchen window I look right down on the roundabout, and when there were no leaves, I can see everything. I heard the word "compliant" a lot. And if the rules aren't quite right for the area, being compliant is not necessarily a good thing. There are several drive-throughs clustered around that roundabout. There's -- of course there's Macadoodles and the gas station pumps behind the area, and then there's Just Jeffs across the way. There is Dunkin Donuts. There's the new approved development just below the office building at 555 East Green Meadows. So that with a two -- two-story residential addition. So there's going to be a lot of people - - there are already a lot of cars. There are many parking lots around there. And so the impression I'm getting from what I hear is that, oh, it's going to be fine because it was all designed to accommodate. But if you would be there at 4:30 or 5:00 in the afternoon, you would see huge lines coming west, yes, west on Green Meadows and they're backed up. And all of the entries and exits to all of these parking lots are going to be very confusing, and I can't see that we can really accommodate another drive-through there. I don't follow this compliance business. Sounds good and it's very fast spoken, sounds really good, but if you live there and look out on it, you can't imagine more cars going around that roundabout in and out another drive-through. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? We do ask questions sometimes, but it looks like you're off the hook this time. Thank you. Any more speakers on this case.

MR. FUENFHOUSEN: Good evening. My name is John, but I go by Scott Fuenfhausen. I'm at 608 Huntridge and I'm also a member of the HOA. My -- I'm another bedroom that overlooks the roundabout. And Marlene actually did a good job of bringing up a number of the elements that I also had concerns of. And I'm very -- when they built River Region Credit Union, I was like, fantastic. You know, it's a great spot, great place for it. All the other developments that went in, I'm like, that sounds great. You know, it sounds good. I'm very pro-business. However, when I found out there was a drive-through restaurant was going to go here, a number of things came up. And as Marlene made mention earlier, Dunkin often has lines that -- you know, remember, on Green Meadows that's a divided road, you know. You cannot make -- you know, if you're coming out of Macadoodles, you have to go west. If you come out of Dunkin, you have to go east. There is no other way. Now, on, I believe that's Carter Lane, it's also very curvy, but that's a two-lane road. And so, you know, most of the fast food restaurants that I've

seen are not on two-lane roads. And, you know, with that much activity around it. So this is going to be -- even though they may share the same exit and egress, that it's also going to be an issue of just traffic. I have also, you know, wanted to kind of also make a point about, you know, it is a single-lane road. But now, I did want to ask a question because you said that the -- because there was a new apartment complex that was approved a year ago, that you're saying now that's not happening?

MS. SMITH: So there were two recent developments. There was a PD plan amendment for a site to the east that had apartments on the top and then office and retail on the first floor. And then further to the east were the existing apartment that are kind of on the west side of that parking lot. The owner requested to go to MC zoning. Staff did not support that and the Commission generally agreed with staff and it did not go anywhere. So there's kind of -- that middle property is the --

MR. FUENFHOUSEN: Which is another thing that could happen, right, another big apartment complex could go in also. The Lizzi & Rocco's is there, another complex and that works. But we've got -- within 50 feet we have -- and one of the drive-throughs also is that River Region Credit Unit has their drive-throughs. So we have four drive-throughs within a 50-foot area of a single-lane roundabout. This is not like the roundabout that's been -- that was beautifully done that was on Forum and Green Meadows, you know. That's a two lane. It handles the traffic and does a really fantastic job. This is a one lane. I mean, the round -- if you take a look at the roundabout now, it's actually already beat up. I can't -- sad to say, but I'm a light sleeper and I hear a lot of late night drunk drivers hit that roundabout full speed. I've heard it many times. And so I can't imagine, you know, more being in there. The other thing I say, you know, this was, from what I understand, zoned in 2000. Well, I also had brown hair in 2000. You know, it's just not there anymore. I mean, so what's changed is the fact that everything around it has really grown. I moved here 17 years ago and moved into this HOA about five years ago. And I've seen the growth and so far it's been pretty good. This is the only one that's really raised my concern with the amount of traffic, you know. And I don't even know the hours of operation of this place, but did they say alcohol and beverage sales as well as I jotted down? And it's also in a very -- if you look at the -- I'm sorry, if you can pull up the sky view. Yeah. If you look at it, it's a very curvy road coming south on Clark. And we have the Veterans United that's on the right -- by the way, also, that building on the Veterans United, that spot next to them is also up for sale zoned commercial. Might be another Veterans United building. I think honestly what isn't. And so, you know, going into a single-lane roundabout is -- it's just you're shoving so many -- it's so much activity into a small area. And that's what probably my biggest concern is.

MS. LOE: Were you prepared to take any questions from the Commission?

MR. FUENFHOUSEN: No. I'm no expert. I teach marketing and business, I'm a -- but I spent 20 years in advertising too, so, you know, I'm a very pro-business guy, but this is one thing that actually made me very concerned. So but please, yeah.

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

MR. STANTON: If the shoe was on the other foot, how would you fix it? How would you fix your concerns?

MR. FUENFHOUSEN: As far as fix it in order to be able to have this establishment there?

MR. STANTON: Yeah. What would make you feel -- what would make you sleep better?

MR. FUENFHOUSEN: You know, honestly, if it was a -- if it was another, you know, like a business, you know, where it's not constant traffic, you know, where people are in at 8:00, they're out at 5:00, you know. That's just traffic, you know. I moved here from Chicago and, you know, Lord, there's not a day without traffic. Right. But when it's a constant fast -- quick-serve restaurant where you have a drive-through, it's going to be -- and open until I'm not sure, it's going to be much more traffic. How do you fix it? I don't know. Do you make the roundabout bigger? But I don't think you have the ability with the space because of what's been approved so far in the development. So the -- it's a great little roundabout, but what's happened is is all the stuff that's come in around it, it's actually now insufficient. With another quick-serve restaurant it is -- you know, I think will overwhelm it. The other thing is it's a city bus route. It's also -- I've stayed on the -- I've seen the school buses go by that, you know, travel through. It's a very -- it's becoming a very busy road, and I don't think we anticipated that. And this, I think, this quick-serve restaurant will actually exacerbate that situation. It can't help but, you know. You want businesses to be successful, so that's only going to mean that it's going to be more busy. There's a lot of folks who walk, that walk their dogs, they jog, and whatever, and are starting to -- and I think Ms. West, Jen West who is part of our -- had emailed in her, I think you got that, her concerns. She's a big walker. And it has become, you know, kind of, you know, tenuous, some risky spot. I think what -- the number of things that -- what is that? River Region it looks like. That's an old picture because it's actually very lovely landscaping now. But that's got a drive-through through it too and sees a lot of activity. You've got people coming out of Macadoodles, you know, coming out of that. And then of course what's missing here too is down in that southeast side -- how old is that picture?

MS. SMITH: So I just grabbed this from Google. I --

MR. FUENFHOUSEN: Okay. This is old --

MS. SMITH: -- think it's 2019 or 2020.

MR. FUENFHOUSEN: -- because what you're missing up here is where that blue -- yeah. That's Lizzi & Rocco's. That's a whole other strip mall, you know. And it's on this. I mean, this is right that you sent, you know. But that's Lizzi & Rocco's and three other businesses and -- and I believe a chiropractor down there. It just is becoming overwhelmed. And that's -- that's my concern with this. I've got a cousin that owns eight McDonalds in Liberty, Missouri, so, which is where I'm from, so I'm very all for business. I'm -- my biggest concern is where this business is going and not, you know, anything more, that the -- how much is going to be overwhelmed in this area with the traffic in a two-lane road with the main artery being divided. And then one of the big problems we're having too with that, if you go down and take a look at that roundabout is, you know, all the curbs are already crumbling and it's mainly because the big semis that come through that are going to Walmart which is just down the road. But also -- and of course stores have to have their deliveries of course. But it's becoming -- and it's not just a rush hour, five o'clock. I always kind of chuckle at rush hour in Columbia, the rush 15 minutes. But it's, you know, it does back up and it does become hazardous and this is only going to make that last longer in this area simply because I think at the time the roundabout was made for the traffic that it was taking, and it did a good job. But now so much has built up around it, it's become overwhelmed. And there's no really anyplace to go with it. And so that's my biggest concern with this -- with this quick-serve restaurant is how much congestion, safety, and accessibility is going to start to -- the accessibility is going to start to really have a problem.

MS. LOE: Your question got answered, Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

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

MR. FUENFHOUSEN: Thank you for listening.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case? I see none. We'll move on to commissioner comments.

MS. CARROLL: Can I ask Staff a question?

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: What was the commission's imagined designation for this?

MR. ZENNER: Commercial.

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: I'd also like to point out that the roundabout design designed at

Green Meadows in this particular location was designed in conjunction with the zoning actions that occurred to establish the commercial zoning for this particular area. So as each individual development component has come in, as it relates to the property the Wendlings owned, the anticipated density of growth in this particular area was anticipated early on. And that is something that our City's traffic engineering division looks at with each and every development proposal as it relates to ingress and egress associated with these sites. While I'll speak to the last speaker's concerns that the traffic volumes in this particular area have increased, so too, since the original approval of this zoning, has the population in south Columbia. We likely have other deficiencies in the transportation system; they have not yet been addressed, that will alleviate particular traffic flow matters on Green Meadows. You know, the Nifong construction has recently been completed in order to increase the capacity on Nifong. We still have a remaining phase of that potentially providing other options for the general public to travel to locations possibly further to the south not utilizing this particular connection. So, I mean, there are -- there are a whole series of other interrelated-transportation related issues all which take time to build out our full road network in order to better and more adequately distribute our traffic throughout the city. But the first and foremost concern that this was not anticipated is not a correct assumption. When this project was designed, this roundabout was designed, the development intensity of this particular location was known and the design at that point was created accordingly. We've got a lot of other background related issues that potentially are influencing the amount of traffic here right now, but this development definitely has been evaluated in all of the developments surrounding it and how it's loading in. Expansion of the roundabout may be challenging, if not not even possible. However, the road segments going in either direction do have adequate road rights-of-way to accommodate potentially additional expansion. But expansion without expanding the choke point which would be the roundabout really is not a worthwhile capital expenditure. So if that's what is identified in the future as additional traffic is loaded into the system, we will have to identify other options better which to achieve getting better traffic flow. Roundabouts in and of themselves prove to move far more traffic than four-way or controlled intersections; and therefore, the ability for this roadway to handle the capacity of traffic traveling on it is a proven engineering, traffic engineering fact, that the road does have the capacity with this design feature. So that's part of the situation that we have here. But do not misunderstand that our staff, from all views, have looked at this to ensure that it does meet our requirements and there are none additional requirements that have been identified as being needed.

MS. LOE: That said, Mr. Zenner, I use what I consider to the Green Meadows

cut-through to head east and I have been backed up at the light on Providence trying to make the heading south, trying to make the east turn onto Green Meadows and been backed up into the travel lane on Providence because there are too many cars trying to make that turn. So I do question -- I mean, that can probably be handled with light timing, but it does indicate to me that something is already out of sync with it. And I did, before the speakers came up, share the concerns with adding drive-through restaurant traffic to that circle, in part because of the divided road in that anyone coming off of Providence has to go through that traffic circle to gain entrance to the restaurant. So we are filing all those cars through there, unless they knew enough or get off earlier. So I'm not fully convinced about the traffic patterns.

MR. ZENNER: There's a conundrum here. You have a state-managed route, Providence Road. You have a City-managed road at Green Meadows. The coordination between signal timing, possibly a dual turn lane, there are a variety of solutions possibly to be explored. Apparently given the -- the condition may not have reached a warrant yet to do something. It may reach a warrant at which MoDOT and the City identify solutions as we have in other locations. So you get to the point of failure, and at that point then that's when I guess we start talking. We're not quite to failure. We may be to less-than-ideal servicing, which is, as you know, A through F is the service schedule. Most of our intersections are probably operating at a level C if I recall correctly. D is still acceptable. E and F are where we get into the troubled areas.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: I was going to call this question unless you all want to discuss more.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Placier.

MS. PLACIER: Yes. I tend to agree with you, Commissioner Loe, about if we're going to get to this point of failure, this is the ideal type of business to put to create failure because of the -- it's fast food, it's fast traffic, it's liable to be wanted at certain times of day, lunch and dinner times. With people coming off the single-turn lane onto Green Meadows and then going around and then into something to deal with all the other people. I also use that as a, you know, a cut-through to get to the Nifong businesses so that I can avoid Nifong. So I wish there was some other kind of commercial development that might go in here that would not create that failure so soon. And I'm not a prognosticator, but that just seems to be the kind of thing that would.

MS. LOE: Additional comments?

MS. RUSHING: I agree with basically what people have been saying about the traffic in that area. For a while I rode the bus, there is a bus stop there, and even, you know, the buildings that are further south, the arrangement of getting around in that area is not very desirable. It's just difficult. And I agree with Commissioner Placier that a drive-through restaurant seems to be the least-desirable type of business for that

location. But I understand the constraints we have if it's already been approved. So it's a difficult situation.

MS. LEE: May I say something?

MS. LOE: We're in commission discussion right now. We can open the floor back up to public comment, but I prefer to let the commissioners finish their discussion.

MS. LEE: Certainly.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: So I agree that there's heavy traffic on this Green Meadows, precisely because so many of us use it as a cut-through to avoid heavy traffic at the Nifong/Providence intersection. I wonder if this continues to be built up, if it will stop being seen as a cut-through to people which weirdly, may be that the traffic balances itself out a little bit. Because I know that I have found myself saying, you know what, I'm not even going to try to go down there, I'm just going to go up to the light. So, I mean, I -- I think it will have an interesting effect that as, you know, some of these businesses are fairly new, I think people's inclination will continue shifting away from using it as a shortcut now that it's not a shortcut.

MS. LOE: I must say that a restaurant in a neighborhood is not a bad match. It's something that people would walk to. So, I mean, that's something that we would allow in an MN district. So it's not necessarily the restaurant, it's -- but it's the drive-through, the traffic aspect that I think is giving us some pause. Any further commission discussion? Commissioner Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: I wonder, a question for legal perhaps. If we generally are not concerned about the restaurant aspect and are merely concerned about the drive-through window aspect, is that something that we can discuss with legal or the applicant changing the SOI? I mean, because I -- I think that this area is going to be developed and I hate the idea of just saying flat no, go start again, if the only hold up is the delivery window.

MR. SHELTON: Is your question can you add conditions?

MS. JONES: Yes. Let's say that's my question.

MR. SHELTON: I think the short answer is yes. I guess I would stop there and then sort of take questions as they come.

MR. ZENNER: Chris, if I could, I'll add some context for this. The C3 zoning district at the time of this ordinance approved -- was approved and the provisions within the UDC which specifically entitle the property owner to proceed under the initial zoning authorization to build their property out exists. It attaches to this particular situation. This is a planned district property that was entitled to uses in the C3 and the 01 or OP

zoning -- CP, all C3 uses, and then the OP zoning district, generally all office 01 uses at the time. In the C3 zoning district as a customary accessory use to any restaurant was a permissible, by right, drive-through. To consider severing that land use entitlement would be to undercut the underlying regulatory approval that was given for the property. And I would suggest and caution the Commission significantly on taking that action. This property is entitled to have a drive-through restaurant, and to decide otherwise I think could potentially result in possibly land use rights being taken.

MS. JONES: I withdraw my question.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: No. That --

MS. LOE: That answered your question. Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Well, thank you for that bit of information, Mr. Zenner. And I was just going to say, if we kept it a planned development which has -- it generally benefits us because there's more green space than required, it, you know, just gives us more time, more leverage. They've done everything. They've played the game. They didn't have ask for any variances. They didn't ask for any, you know. They played the game, gave us what we needed. I plan to support it. I do see the traffic, but I helped build some of that stuff out there a long time ago. But what can we do. We can't move it. We can't increase the roundabout. It was designed for growth. The vision is to make this commercial. I mean, everything is lined up. Everything's right. I plan to support it.

MS. LOE: One silver lining or one piece that's not commercial, we do have that Climax Forest to the east, right, or --

MS. SMITH: This is OP.

MR. ZENNER: So you've got the OP piece that's undeveloped north of the existing office building.

MS. LOE: But also further to the east --

MR. ZENNER: And further to the east you have --

MS. LOE: -- that was the swap out for --

MR. ZENNER: That was the swap out for some of the exchange --

(Multiple simultaneous speakers.)

MR. ZENNER: And the regional detention basin is a little bit further to the east of that. So the detention basin, if I'm not incorrect -- Mr. Crockett, correct me if I'm wrong -- lies between the eastern boundary of Mr. Wendling's property where you can see the trail, what looks like a trail, and the apartment complex that is immediately further east of that. There is again another Climax forestry preservation area that was part of the Grindstone Walmart project to the east of the apartment complex. So a lot of this

particular area from a development perspective is pretty well accounted for.

MS. SMITH: We will see a mixed-use building here.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah.

MS. SMITH: And then potentially an office building here. And then it's built out.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. That were in essence built out. So with the exception of what is right around where the apartments --

MS. SMITH: Oh, yeah. That --

(Multiple simultaneous speakers.)

MS. SMITH: It's still zoned PD.

MR. ZENNER: And that is not nearly as constrained from right-of-way upgrading if necessary. And of course it moves back to another node. Another thing with the observation here is this is identified as a commercial node within Columbia imagined. It's developing just as that. And I think Ms. Geuea Jones's comment is actually somewhat -- it's counterintuitive, but it may be more intuitive than we may think. And again, the roadway connection that I referred to that has not been built is the roadway connection that would offload traffic further south at the Gans interchange, at Discovery, and provide a connection back to South 163, south of the State Farm property which would potentially offload traffic utilizing the Grindstone corridor to be able to access the southern portion of the city of which, if people choose to take the crosscut or the shortcut that exists today, the Green Meadows corridor, they may find it is more efficient to take an alternative route where you're not fighting stop-and-go traffic of signalized intersections. That road corridor plan has been completed, but it has not yet been executed. And so that is the incomplete component of the transportation network to serve really a parallel cross-city connection within Columbia. Once that connection is constructed, it is very possible that we may see significant decreases in the in-between traffic to levels that are more capable of being handled with the existing infrastructure. That is something to look forward to. The public has that to look forward to. We have that to look forward to. And right now the question at hand is is this particular proposal good for this particular location.

MS. LOE: Any commissioner comments.

MS. CARROLL: I like this plan. If I'm judging by the plan that was submitted itself, I appreciate that they've exceeded the amount of landscaping. The traffic flow in the plan itself makes sense. The parking makes sense. The traffic of the roundabout, I hear your concerns, I really do. If that drive-through use goes with the PD plan that the property has, I don't feel that I would be -- I don't feel that I would be judging them fairly if I -- I guess if they have to have the PD, I -- I don't know. I like the plan as a whole. I can't

separate the two. If it has to go with it, then I think that it does.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: Oh, no. I defer.

MS. LOE: All right. Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: My fellow commissioners, if there are no more comments, concerns, questions of staff, in the matter of Case 003-2022, a request to approve the PD plan and associated plan and the statement of intent for Lot 2 of the Providence South Plaza Plot 2, to permit a drive-through restaurant, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Just very briefly, I strongly suggest each commissioner vote their conscious on this.

MS. RUSHING: I do admire the setback to 25 feet of green space. There's not much on the adjoining lot, and I do like the attention to that on this particular one.

MS. LOE: Any additional discussion on this motion? Seeing none, Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call please.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Burns.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Rushing.

MS. RUSHING: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier.

MS. PLACIER: No.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell.

MS. KIMBELL: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: My vote is yes. Commissioner Loe.

MS. LOE: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: We have eight to approve and one to deny. The motion carries.

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

Before we move on to the next case, were there any additional public comments?

Seeing none --

MS. DOCKEN: I want to comment.

MS. LOE: Sorry, Dee.

MR. MACMANN: The court reporter, she could not hear you. Could you repeat that for our court reporter please.

MS. DOCKEN: Dee Docken 804, Again Street. My ears perked up when you start talking about Gans Road because of the need to plan in that area. And I really think that if you want to move people across town in a fast way, it might be a good idea to make that a parkway or limit development in that. And I think that would be a good thing to -- for this group to be planning on as well as the fringe area along Gans Wild -- Gans Creek Wild Area.

In the matter of Case 003-2022, move to approve the PD plan and associated statement of intent for Lot 2 of the Providence South Plaza Plot 2, to permit a drive-through restaurant.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Stanton, MacMann, Carroll, Geuea Jones and Kimbell

No: 1 - Placier

Case # 06-2022

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of P1316 LLC (owner), for approval of a 7-lot PD development plan for a mixed-use commercial development on property zoned PD (Planned Development) to be known as *The Kitchen & Discovery Offices*, which will include office, retail, residential and outdoor recreation; the request also includes a revision to the Statement of Intent to include *Outdoor entertainment or recreation* as a permitted use. The 10.64-acre property is located at the southwest corner of Discovery Parkway and Endeavor Avenue.

MS. LOE: Thank you. All right. Moving on to the next case which is 06-2022, a request by Crockett Engineering Consultants on behalf of P1316, LLC for approval of a seven-lot PD development plan for a mixed-use commercial development on property zoned PD, planned development, to be known as the Kitchen and Discovery Offices which will include office, retail, residential, and outdoor recreation. The request also includes a revision to the statement of intent to include outdoor entertain or recreation as a permitted use. The 10.64-acre property is located at the southwest corner of Discovery Parkway and Endeavor Avenue. May we have a staff report please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends support of adding outdoor recreation along with approving the actual Kitchen and Discovery Office Park PD plan.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Before we move on to questions for staff, I'd like to ask any commissioner who has had any ex parte related to this case to share that

with us now. Also, if there's any commissioner who would like to be recused.

MR. STANTON: Yes, Madam Chair. I do a lot of business in this area, so I'm just going to play it safe.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. That's it for recusals. Any ex parte? Seeing none, any questions for staff. Commissioner Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: Sorry. I've got to ask for clarification; I may have understood something wrong. You referred to parking reduction. I thought that staff suggested sharing parking sites with neighboring buildings that would allow for parking reduction, and that they did not do that.

MR. ZENNER: So the staff report makes a reference to required parking. So the numbers here on this slide are the correct numbers. Deferred parking, the deferral of the 38 additional spaces which are shown on the plan is being offset by the fact that they can, the applicant has the ability to take advantage of the different peak hours of the users of the site, the office uses versus the entertainment uses. If that did not exist, you still would potentially have that opportunity, if the applicant had chosen not to look at it from that perspective. Even if they provided the 38 parking spaces, they still would be within their maximum permitted. So we're getting a benefit out of the fact that they've chosen to reduce the impervious surface acknowledging that there is an opportunity to use the parking reduction ratios that we have. But they may not be being used to their fullest extent. And Mr. Crockett may be able to respond to are they using the maximum parking reduction ratios, and if they could, would they be willing to potentially defer even more parking. And I would guess the answer will be we really don't want to defer more parking because our tenants want to have enough parking and having less forces it elsewhere. Even -- and I think what they would probably tell you is they'd be concerned that don't start too small, start with what you know you don't need and then if you have to, you can add in. So they've parked it pursuant to the code at 441. They wanted 479 initially. And they realized after talking with our staff that reducing the parking to get it to 441 and using the concept of differential peaks, that that likely would be more than enough. So what they've chosen to element, the 38 spaces temporarily or permanently in the future, depending how site plays out, is what they are comfortable with and that's what the proposal is for.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Placier.

MS. PLACIER: Yes. What is your understanding of where the residents of those 44 dwellings, where they would park?

MR. ZENNER: I will leave that to Mr. Crockett to determine or specifically express. I'm assuming since these buildings, this building, which is Building 1 is a mix,

it's two stories of residential ground-floor retail, I would -- I would assume, just given trends that we see often, your retail parking going to be on the lower level closest to the building. Residential parking could be somewhere out in the middle of the parking field as identified in probably marked spaces, Resident Parking Only. That would be a more detailed question that Mr. Crockett can answer though.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? If there aren't, we will open up the floor for public comment. Please give your name and address for the record.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I believe Mr. Zenner did a thorough staff report on this project. It is a little bit different than what we've seen before. It's an outdoor recreational space you don't see too often. It does have an office component to it that we are putting around this complex. The residential -- excuse me. The office component is going to be similar to the office component that's north of this project by a fair amount. If you're familiar with Discovery, this commission has seen a lot of plans in Discovery, more than has been built. One of the first ones was an office complex that's on the north side of this site. And this is an office complex that would be, kind of flank it on the far south side and would be filled in with commercial between them along 63. As you've seen in the plan, the parking for this development is internal to the development. We wanted to shield and screen as much as we can with buildings. We believe that's what the UDC is kind of formed around. They want to have the buildings that have the front entryways onto adjacent streets, that park internal, kind of screen that from the public rights-of-way. So that's what the layout has basically done in this location. With regards to shared parking, we did reduce it by 38 spaces as Mr. Zenner indicated. This use, we want to make sure that we do have ample parking for this use as well as the residential uses. We understand we're going to be in off hours, but again, this entire development is limited on total impervious surface and so limited -- the impervious surface for this development is very precious, so we don't want to build a bunch of extra parking if we don't need it. So we understand that. My clients have looked at this development, looked at other developments very similar to this throughout the country and looked at parking demands and parking requirements and how many parking spaces are provided and have gone to those facilities and looked to see how many parking spaces are actually being used. Some instances they might be well-parked. Some instances may be overparked, and quite often, they are underparked and they're parking along the streets and they're parking in the right-of-ways of other locations. So they've looked at that and thought very carefully because again, impervious surface on this entire Discovery area is limited over the entire development. So they feel that what they're providing -- or what they're

proposing is what they -- would be needed for not only the Kitchen but also the residential uses as well as the office uses. Again, we are reducing a few of those spaces; we've taken them out. We don't need them, so we're not going to put them in. So that's how we'll look at that. The three-story residential and commercial mixed-use building, Mr. Zenner is correct; we believe that the spaces adjacent to the commercial uses will be dedicated for the commercial uses themselves, and probably some of them across the parking lot as well. The residential portion may be slid a little bit further internal to the development for the residents. We want to make sure the commercial component is well-parked as well. That three-story building is going to mimic the other three-story buildings on the three other corner-- excuse me, two other corners of the roundabout, so it's going to match, it's going to be a nice entryway. It's going to feel like all three of them are very similar in nature, so it's going to give a very nice, aesthetically appealing look as go through that roundabout. The main focal point of this is obviously the Kitchen. The pickleball development if you will, it's a multi-use development. Of course it has several pickleball courts inside and several outside. Some of them outside are actually covered, some are uncovered. It's got a lot of seating areas. It's got a lot of socialization areas. It's got indoor areas for restaurant, outdoor areas for seating for the restaurant. And of course it's got the stage as well. I believe Staff included my correspondence with regards to the stage. And, of course, I state in there it says, The stage is rather small and not intended primarily for small bands. Well, that was a mistake. That "not" should not have been in there. Yeah. And I believe actually Dee called our office today and asked about that. And, whoa, whoa, that's incorrect. I'd already seen it, but I didn't think it would really matter, but certainly that word "not" makes a big difference. So it is intended for small bands. We're not looking to have large bands. Certainly not KISS, not, you know, Def Leppard. But, Mr. Zenner, I took you more of a Metallica kind of guy. You know, you learn something new every day I guess. So anyway, so it is unique development. We are looking for, you know, a nice outdoor area. As things change, pickleball is big, you know, a big draw right now. We see that as something that we can not only have leagues and have, you know, recreational areas for, but also make it a social component as well, more than just that. Again, one unique thing about this is that we do have a turf area for lawn games, yard games during the spring, fall, and summer months that we can convert -- how can we do this and make this a year-round thing, let's make a small ice rink out of it as well. So we're working with suppliers and other folks trying to design that and make that work. It's been done in other locations so it certainly can be. It's going to be a unique component to this piece of property and I think it's going to be well-received. And so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Crockett? Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Before I ask my question, did you want to ask your question? Did we do that already? My apologies. Never mind. Mr. Crockett, thank you very much. I answered my own question.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Mr. Crockett, you referred to the stage as rather small. I'm just wondering what your standard is.

MR. CROCKETT: Relatively small. We're not looking at a large -- when I say -- I shouldn't say large. A small stage. I'm talking about a small event. We're not looking to have sole-- solely, you know, a large, you know, the whole event be focused around a concert. We're not looking for a large concert. You know, it's not a large concert venue. It's something more of a -- what we envision, like a Rose Music Hall or something that's going to be smaller scale.

MS. LOE: So how big is it compared to the outdoor Rose Park stage?

MR. CROCKETT: I believe Rose Park or Rose Music Hall, just off rough calculations is -- just off rough calculations off measuring off an aerial was about 800 to a thousand square feet, somewhere in that range. And this one, I believe, we had a note in there, is about 1,400 square feet.

MS. LOE: So when I checked Rose Park stage was 32 by 24, so it's roughly 750 square feet.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay.

MS. LOE: So this is almost double that.

MR. CROCKETT: Then that would be, yes.

MS. LOE: Yeah. So I was little -- I mean, Missouri Theatre without wings --

MR. CROCKETT: Right.

MS. LOE: -- is 870 feet --

MR. CROCKETT: And it's --

MS. LOE: -- with wings, it's 1,900--

MR. CROCKETT: It's not just totally just a stage area. We've also got that designated as outdoor seating as well when it's not being used as a stage or an event situation. It's additional outdoor seating, gaming area. It's, you know, there is --

MS. LOE: That was a coming up question, but if we can just focus. When people aren't seated there, it's twice as big as the Rose park stage. So, I mean, I guess I'm objecting to the characterization of rather small --

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Okay.

MS. LOE: -- when it's twice as big as other venues we have in town.

MR. CROCKETT: Right. I know --

MS. LOE: That seem to be -- and that venue is the same size as Blue Note stage. So if that's sort of our standard for small --

MR. CROCKETT: Understood.

MS. LOE: -- music venues.

MR. CROCKETT: And what --

MS. LOE: I think you should correct this.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. And I -- to me, I think it would be small. I would think maybe, you know, there's no clarification of what small would be. I would fall back that -- and we had discussion with Planning on this as well. And the fall back is in the situation is we're not allowed to have amplified sound across the property line without a special use permit through the City. And so that would always be something to fall back on as well if this -- if it becomes an issue --

MS. LOE: I --

MR. CROCKETT: -- then that's a fall back for the City. It's not something that's on the zoning. It's not something that's on the planning zone. It's an ordinance of the City of Columbia. So regardless of the size of the stage, it's always something that can obviously be enforced.

MS. LOE: I don't think it's a fall back. I think it's the governing --

MR. CROCKETT: Right. Right. I'm saying --

MS. LOE: -- ordinance.

MR. CROCKETT: That's another -- that's another --

MS. LOE: I think we need to strike the "rather small" off any future descriptions because it appears inconsistent --

MR. CROCKETT: I understand.

MS. LOE: -- just with other venues or -- I mean, unless it's smaller than other venues.

MR. CROCKETT: I understand.

MS. LOE: Because that does need -- I mean, I agree with the issues that staff brought up, and that characterization seems to mitigate them, but --

MR. CROCKETT: And we don't want to -- we don't want to have a mischaracterization.

MS. LOE: Yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: You know, we don't. And also, when I say relatively small too, it's relatively small in -- as a component of this development which is, it is something

else we're looking at as well. Certainly don't want to mischaracterize the situation either.

So --

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. CROCKETT: -- we're happy to -- happy to --

MS. LOE: It's not dependent on the stage size. This is an ordinance saying amplified noise can't cross the property lines, which I'm really interested to hear -- see how that gets carried out. My other question was what is the intended program for the interior gaming use?

MR. CROCKETT: They have different --

MS. LOE: Is that arcade?

MR. CROCKETT: No. No. It's more yard game type stuff I believe, looking for more of the social aspect. They've got -- I believe I've seen architectural renderings, I think there's some interior sofas and seating areas. Just I think there's, you know, the larger Jenga-type scenario that you've seen and some of the larger yard games. It's more the -- in looking at doing that exterior, but then we don't want the entire mix-- everything to be an exterior component. We have to have some interior for bad weather days and that kind of situation.

MS. LOE: We don't get those in Missouri.

MR. CROCKETT: No, not at all.

MS. LOE: All right. I'm just going to go down the line. So Commissioner Burns.

MS. BURNS: Thank you. Is there a plan for overflow parking? I'm thinking about even if it -- whatever we classify the size of the stage and a concert that might attract or an event that might attract a large number of people, I'm wondering if 440 parking spaces can accommodate that, or if there's a plan for event parking.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, we don't want to get -- first of all, we don't want to get too large with it. Okay. It's -- again, it's not the focal point. The stage is not going to be the focal point of this development. And if we have 440 parking spaces in this development and every car has two or three individuals, the space itself can't support that. And we have looked at additional spaces because we're doing a development, and you'll see this coming before the Planning and Zoning Commission, just to the north of this that has additional spaces. And so there is a common-shared agreement with regard to the lots, with regard to the parking all the way across all the properties that are out here. But we don't envision that if the number of spaces on this piece of property are fully built out, the event venue itself would support much more than that. And so while you might think, well, okay, we can have a lot more people, a lot more cars. But we can't get the people into the venue.

MS. BURNS: Okay. So I guess A, somebody would just have to turn around and go home if there was not a spot for them to park. And I'm thinking with Rose Music Hall, which is part of the North Village Arts District, on our First Fridays on a really nice Friday night, we can have hundreds, maybe a couple thousand people down there.

MR. CROCKETT: Uh-huh.

MS. BURNS: So, but there's overflow parking. You can go other places.

MR. CROCKETT: Right. And again, there is some overflow, other adjacent developments that are out here. And again, we are looking at commercial development that would be to the -- this thing's all kind of twisted, but kind of to the north and to the east that we're looking at commercial establishments that would have overflow parking.

MS. BURNS: So somebody might have to hoof it, but there's --

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. Yeah. You're going to have to -- we -- at the same time, we don't want to -- for the rare occasion that we have a large event like that, if we were going to have one, we don't want to park this site for that. It's like parking Walmart for Black Friday.

MS. BURNS: I get it. All right.

MR. CROCKETT: And we don't -- we don't want that situation.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: A comment. I lived by the Rose for a long time and having done Roots & Blues for years and then parked across the way, organization, engineering makes way more -- the engineering of what the back of that stage is made and how the sound comes off that stage has way more to do with that than whether it's amplified or not. And that's not necessarily integrated into city code which is kind of frustrating, but doing Roots & Blues, we had to do that to appease the neighbors. We just had a sound engineer shooting sounds out there. The Rose is poorly designed, as a matter of fact. It's too loud. Just FYI for whoever, it's the design of that stage that's going to make all the difference in that sound.

MR. CROCKETT: Understood. And we actually -- Commissioner MacMann, I'm glad you brought that up. The architect actually has consulted acoustic engineers for, you know, both for sound for the entire development, including the stage, but both for sound amplification to get sound out, but also to make sure that we don't -- you know, we put the right direction at the right spot.

MR. MACMANN: That's what it's all about.

MR. CROCKETT: Similar to lighting. You've got to have the right light, the right spot and it does great. Because spillage doesn't do the job.

MR. MACMANN: It certainly can be done is what I'm saying.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: The 19,000 square feet space, the large indoor recreation space, I think in the staff report it's described as being an indoor pickleball?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. JONES: Is that a space that is going to be divided up and just for indoor pickleball or is it like -- could it also be used as a convention plan as long as you don't mind a pickleball --

MR. CROCKETT: No. It's actually -- it's actually being set up for an indoor pickleball court. So there's a bar section to it, very -- you know, to help with the outdoor service areas, so there is that component to the building. But it's being set up for an indoor pickleball space.

MS. JONES: So it's single use?

MR. CROCKETT: That's what we're setting it up for. I guess it could be -- I guess you could have it as assembly, I guess, but that's certainly not the intention that we're going to use it for. I mean, there's -- you know, we're not putting a stage in there to have an indoor music situation or anything like that. We're setting it up for the primary use as indoor pickleball. Could it be used as assembly? I guess it could, but I don't know what the intent of that would be. We're not really -- we're not putting in tables and chairs and seating for more restaurant space to put more people in it. It's -- the use is pickleball.

MS. JONES: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for Mr. Crockett? I see none. Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none, we'll close public comment. Commission comment. Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Commissioner Kimbell, did you have something? Okay. If there are no other comments, concerns by fellow commissioners, I would like to make a motion. In the matter of Case 006-2022, a PD plan and modification to an SOI to add outdoor recreation area, the Kitchen and Discovery Office PD plan, I move to approve.

MS. JONES: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Geuea Jones. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Seeing none, Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call please.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton. Oh, he's abstaining. Commissioner Burns.

MS. BURNS: Yes.
 MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Rushing.
 MS. RUSHING: Yes.
 MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann.
 MR. MACMANN: Aye.
 MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Geuea Jones.
 MS. JONES: Yes.
 MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier.
 MS. PLACIER: Yes.
 MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell.
 MS. KIMBELL: Yes.
 MS. CARROLL: My vote is yes. Commissioner Loe.
 MS. LOE: Yes.
 MS. CARROLL: We have eight votes to approve and one abstention. The motion carries.

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

In the matter of Case 006-2022, a PD plan and modification to an SOI to add outdoor recreation area, the Kitchen and Discovery Office PD plan, move to approve.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, MacMann, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Kimbell and Placier

Abstain: 1 - Stanton

Case # 24-2022

A request by the City of Columbia to amend Chapter 29, Sections 29-1.11 [Definitions]; 29-3.2 [Permitted Use Table]; 29-3.3 [Use-specific Standards]; and 29-4.3 [Parking and loading].

MS. LOE: That brings us to our final case for the evening, Case 24-2022, a request by the City of Columbia to amend Chapter 29, sections 29-1.11, Definitions; 29-3.2, Permitted Use Table; 29-3.3, Use-Specific Standard; and 29-4.3, Parking and Loading. 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 all three amendments as presented, pursuant to conversations had previously and research compiled.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Do we need to do ex parte for this one?

MR. ZENNER: You're more than welcome too if you'd like. May as well.

MS. LOE: Before we have questions for staff, I'd like to ask any commissioner that has any ex parte related to this case to please share that with the Commission so

we all have the benefit of the same information on the case in front of us. No ex parte. No one wanted to talk about light vehicle parking. All right. Questions for staff. Commissioner Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: Yes. So when you separate out gas station and light vehicle repair, I'm wondering how would you consider a gas station that also has light vehicle repair and how do you determine what the primary use is?

MR. ZENNER: Typically when we get into a mixed-use structure, one that has multiple uses within it, you normally would look at what the allocation of space is. So if the preponderance of the activity at the facility is for vehicle repair, you're going to class it by vehicle repair. So if the pumps are real minimal, if you had a one or two-pump gas station, I think what we can use is the Sinclair gas station on the corner of Rollins and Providence as maybe the quintessential example, you could -- there's two ways you could go about. You can either take what the predominant land use is, what is the activity, the predominant land use activity, or you can take them by their individual parts. Again, it typically is one that we would normally take from the preponderance of the activity. So if major automobile repair or repairs, the principle activity of what their income is generated off of, we would use that as the parking requirement. Obviously the pump islands still have parking associated with them. You're normally not storing a vehicle at a gas station. You may be storing a vehicle at a repair facility. And that would be possibly how we would have to draw that differentiation. It's a unique question. It's a unique situation. We don't run into it very frequently, so I think that would be one that would be more of a case by case. We definitely need to draw the distinction because the 1 to 300 parking ratio on a standard gas station actually is going to overpark a gas station that has convenience. And that's what we're trying to avoid here. We're trying to avoid creating unnecessary paved surface.

MS. CARROLL: So a gas station couldn't name themselves light repair in order to acquire more parking?

MR. ZENNER: I don't think so. I mean, if you had ten pumps and you have 500 square foot service facility, we'd call you a gas station with convenience.

MS. CARROLL: Did you mean Rollins and Stadium or Rollins and South Providence?

MR. ZENNER: I'm sorry. Rollins and Stadium.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. I was going to say, I don't think there's a Sinclair there.

MR. ZENNER: Where Dino's located.

MS. CARROLL: I know which one.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Manager Zenner, when we did the carve out for the gas station across for Snookie's, Lucky's, whatever you want to call it, that was a specific carve out for that specific gas station so that it could continue to exist?

MR. ZENNER: It was the carve out -- if my recollection serves me correctly, they are the only two gas stations for downtown, they were at the time. And the carve out was specifically to allow them to continue to operate aside from having to bring their building forward because of circulation-related issues.

MR. MACMANN: And I made that motion.

MR. ZENNER: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: And that's why I'm -- and one of the reasons we had a different -- this is arcana for those of you who were not here, I'm sorry. We would love to add another gas station in the MDT and I just want to make sure that in order to make the UDC more orderly, we didn't just allow regular gas stations back downtown.

MR. ZENNER: I would have to go back and specifically check, but if my recollection serves me correctly, the general provisions of the MDT, they have a specific provision that talks about fueling center with convenience as a completely identified section --

MR. MACMANN: And it has to -- and it has to be brought up.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. And --

MR. MACMANN: So their exception only applies in what we talked about as MDT West?

MR. ZENNER: Correct.

MR. MACMANN: Which is that still in the map?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, it is.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. I just want to make sure. Because it's in your amendment, but you didn't mention it.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: So the non-RDL application is only on MDT West?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct.

MR. MACMANN: I just, I just want to make sure we're not screwing something up by fixing something.

MR. ZENNER: And if you will give me a moment and I can get to that particular section, because I know which provision you're referring to. And if I'm not incorrect, I think it's in the General Provision section of MDT.

MR. MACMANN: So you make the motion, Mr. Smith found it because there was no functional definition outside the MDT, although there was a functional within the MDT. Is that what you said?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. The definition for fueling center with convenience

--

(Multiple simultaneous speakers.)

MR. MACMANN: -- but wasn't anywhere else.

MR. ZENNER: Nowhere else. So what we're trying to pull forward is that functional definition. And the reason that we use specific standard and had it deleted out of vehicle service repair was because of the use-specific standard under vehicle service repair only existed as a use-specific standard where we had gas station incorporated in the definition. And that -- and why we did that, I do not know. And I think we did it because we didn't want to put fueling center in the permitted-use table at the time given the concern that we did not want any more gas stations within the downtown, within the MDT.

MR. MACMANN: A standard gas station.

MR. ZENNER: A standard gas station. So again, let me see if I can --

MR. MACMANN: I just want to make sure --

MR. ZENNER: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: -- when we bring this forward, we're not repermitting a giant Argos on a whole square block or something.

MR. ZENNER: So in Section 29-4.2(d) if I'm not incorrect, I believe it is in D. Yes, in D. So 29-4.2(d) which are the general building form standards for the MDT, specifically paragraph 12.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: This is 29-4.2(d)12, it specifically reads, Gas station or fueling center with a convenience store. A gas station or fueling center with a convenience store shall be permitted use within the urban general west frontage type as shown on the regulating plan and shall not be subject to the required building line setback as defined for other uses within said frontage type.

MR. MACMANN: We're not touching that.

MR. ZENNER: We're not touching that at all. So what we've done in essence by creating use-specific standard SS, is we have duplicated a very specific use-specific standard only addressed in the MDT and we have identified it now in the general application to fueling centers throughout the city, but again, with the specific exception that that use-specific standard only applies to urban general west in the MDT. So it's a

duplication of the same standard in the MDT but now made easier for the public to find when they're looking to find out what can I do, where do I put gas station and what do I have to comply with.

MR. MACMANN: Just, I want to make sure the protections are in place. That's all I'm doing.

MR. ZENNER: And it's not going away.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Manager Zenner.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none, we will open the floor to public comment. Please give your name and address for the record.

MR. TRABUE: I'm Tom Trabue, Trabue Engineering, 3530 South Old Bridge Road, Columbia, Missouri. I want to speak in favor of these amendments. You've all seen me at a couple of the work sessions. I want to applaud -- and Mr. Zenner did an awesome job describing it all, but I really want to -- I stuck it out tonight to applaud not only the staff but also the Planning and Zoning commission. I was very involved when the UDC was adopted in 2017. And at the time we wanted to make sure that it was a living document and that it could address these types of issues as they came up. And so I was really delighted to see that it worked the way we planned for it to work, and I just wanted to say thank you for that.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? One minute.

MR. MACMANN: Just a comment, Mr. Trabue. The next time either one of us see Mark Fargon, we need to remind him of that.

MR. NORGARD: Peter Norgard, 1602 Hinkson Avenue. I'm partially responsible for why we're here talking about this tonight and I'm a little surprised not to see some of the principles that were involved. I have a complaint, a question, a recommendation, and a few general observations. First, the complaint. The Unified Development Code is initially designed with national standards in mind, which may not be properly calibrated, as Mr. Zenner stated in the course of the public hearing, the Board of Adjustment Case 273-2021. However, we have had several parking cases come before us, two involving this particular applicant and two involving the public schools. And despite that I only see that we're making changes for the way parking is interpreted for light vehicle service or repair. So I'm a little disappointed by that. My question would be in staff report Table 1 is presented as evidence that Columbia's currently the most restrictive of the sampling of towns. I'm curious if Staff's research turned up towns that were as restrictive or more restrictive than Columbia, and if they did, I'm just curious why -- why they might have been left off. Not saying that they were or weren't. And I would also argue that the scale of the towns that were selected as the basis for this number are not really consistent with

our population size. Iowa City's about 180,000. Wichita's about, almost 400,000 people. So I think that that's just something to consider. I have a small recommendation. Section 29-4.3(b)1 states, The minimum and maximum off-street parking requirements for all uses allowed in this code are listed in the Table 4.3-1. Since you're striking the maximum from the title of the table, I would suggest you also strike maximum from the line of code where it actually refers to the table. Otherwise it's a little confusing. My general observations. I understand the necessity for calibrating parking standards and I can plainly see that it's being targeted to very specific use. What has me concerned here is not you, not this body in particular, but in general I see an alarming trend in this town where a business shows up, complains that the rules are too restrictive, makes the promise of investment and taxable revenue and then asks the City to change the rules on their behalf. And that's kind of what I see happening here. The reason I say that is because, you know, this Board of Adjustment case was two months ago. You're here tonight talking about changing the parking restrictions two months after a very controversial meeting and there is nobody here. So I really feel like this is going really fast. It took us over two years to get five lousy speed humps in a speed table in our neighborhood to provide some protection for a far larger number of people. So I just, I -- I would like to see this process slow down a little bit so that there can actually be a little bit more of a robust public hearing process. And that's all I have to say.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Norgard. Any questions for this speaker?

Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: I do have a comment for Mr. Norgard. Mr. Norgard, I generally agree with you. And Staff's protestations or demonstration that their new calculation goes from 70, which I thought was way excessive, to 67, is not giving them everything they want. It's more than anyone else gets. The cap in my head was 50 or 35. And I mean, just to let you know, I'm going to be making a separate motion for this one, and I'll be voting against it, because I think it's too permissive. And I was -- and I agree with you that one person complained and the entire system jumped, and they're not even local. It wasn't -- so I find it problematic also. Thank you for bringing it up. Thank you for being here.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I agree too with some of the observations that were raised by Mr. Norgard. Thank you. Any additional comments? Seeing none, we'll close public comment. Commission comment. Commission Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks. Yeah. I agree with some of the concerns that were raised. I have a hard time separating this from the case that brought it up. I'm not sure that I'm comfortable with having a case that's denied at Board of Adjustment coming to us

to change the definition, at least so quickly. I would like more public input if possible. One of the things that bothered me and I think Planner Smith did a great job making his case that there is need for more parking in light vehicle repair. But when I look at the table provided, Table 1, when you eliminate the line for current UVC, because we know that's too small already, and you eliminate the two lines for prior UVC because those are no longer relevant and out of range, that gives us seven comparable cities. And Iowa City at 67, although we've seen them do good research on other parts of their code, that's the second highest of the comparable cities. Only Austin, Texas is higher, and I know they're a lot more populous than we are. I have a hard time believing that we would need more parking for a similar development than Kansas City, Fayetteville, or Fort Collins, Colorado. It just -- it just feels like too much to me.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: To answer Manager Zenner's question, I would like to vote on these separately so that there are different votes. Council can clearly see that and separate out any commentary that the commissioners might have.

MS. LOE: Additional comments? Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: With that in mind, I'm going to make a motion. Mr. Zenner, could you make return to the screen, the -- I just want to make sure that we've got --

MR. ZENNER: Which screen?

MR. MACMANN: You know, I've got it in front of me. I'm going to make three, for your legal consumption here, I'm going to make three separate motions for each of the amendments. In the matter of Case 24-2022, Amendment to the UDC, number A1, I move to approve.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Rushing. Just for everyone's clarification, A1, mine included, is changing the definition -- or adding -- moving the definition of gas station or fueling station.

MR. ZENNER: It's actually both, Ms. Loe.

MS. LOE: And modifying the definition for light vehicle service and repair.

MR. ZENNER: If you would like me to further clarify what's being asked, I'm just reading the title of Amendment A1 which is Revision of Section 29-1.11, Definitions for light vehicle service or repair and gas station or fueling center.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

MR. MACMANN: I move. Ms. Rushing, do you want to second that again?

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MS. LOE: Any motion on the floor? Any further discussion on this motion?

Seeing none, Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call please.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Burns.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Rushing.

MS. RUSHING: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier.

MS. PLACIER: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell.

MS. KIMBELL: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: My vote is yes. Commissioner Loe.

MS. LOE: Yes.

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

MR. MACMANN: If I may.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: I will make the motion. Just to let my fellow commissioners know, I'm making all of these in the affirmative. Madam Chair, if you could explicate when we're done, that would be great. In the matter of Case 24-2022 and that is the UDC amendment number A2 which states --

MS. LOE: Revision of Section 29-3.2, Permitted-Use Table and Section 29-3.3, Use-Specific Standards.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Mr. MacMann, seconded by Ms. Rushing. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? I see none. Ms. -- Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Burns.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Rushing.

MS. RUSHING: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier.

MS. PLACIER: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell.

MS. KIMBELL: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: My vote is yes. Commissioner Loe.

MS. LOE: Yes.

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

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: In the matter of Case 24-2022, amendment to the UDC number A3, I move to approve.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MS. LOE: Just for clarification, this is a revision of Section 29-4.3, Parking and Loading requiring parking for light vehicle service and repair and gas station or fueling center.

MR. ZENNER: If I may ask, Ms. Loe, would you be adding in the revision to 29-4.3(a) -- (b)1 to strike the, And maximum, within the first sentence to match the revision to the table?

MS. LOE: Yes. I think that was a good recommendation.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you.

MS. LOE: If Commissioner MacMann --

MR. MACMANN: Ms. Rushing, is that amenable to you?

MS. RUSHING: Yes.

MS. LOE: All right. The amended motion's on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: I'll be voting no.

MS. LOE: And I'll be voting yes because we are keeping the parking for the gas station or fueling center at 500 square feet, which I believe reflects the use of that. And per our discussions in work session, we are revising the parking requirement for the light vehicle service or repair to 300 square feet, 1 per 300 square feet which matches the current requirement for general retail which is a permitted use in the zoning and seems reasonable. Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: I understand, but they need to double that. That's what I have

a problem with.

MS. LOE: They all do.

MR. MACMANN: And I appreciate that. That's why I'm voting no.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: If you'll forgive me, I had -- one of the things that bothers me is that we're changing the minimum that applies to everyone. I understand the need to potentially increase the maximum, but if somebody can do their business with less than that, less than 33 per 10,000 square feet, I think we should encourage them to do that. I hate to use minimums as a mechanism to do this, even though that's the framework that exists in the UDC. It's something that has bothered me all along.

MS. LOE: All right. So this is how our table is set up for all uses, and we did discuss, as an alternative, modifying the percentage. And no, we didn't. We decided that we did not want to modify the general percentage and it was better to be specific and just target this one use. Yes. No, that was a different way of doing it.

MS. CARROLL: Agreed.

MS. LOE: All right. Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: This will be my third bite at the apple. I don't want anyone --

MS. LOE: Does anyone else have a comment before Mr. MacMann takes over?

MS. RUSHING: I thought we had a motion on the floor.

MR. MACMANN: We did. We're discussing that motion still.

MS. RUSHING: And you are just going to continue discussing? Is that it?

MR. MACMANN: I'm going to rejoin Ms. Commissioner Loe's statement. That's what I'm doing.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: A reminder, our 2017 parking requirements which at the very end of the UDC period were significantly expanded and were expanding them again. And they were expanded in 2017 at the desire of one member of the community. I'm done, Ms. Rushing. Thank you.

MS. RUSHING: Okay. My response is that we discussed this in work session and, you know, to tell basically Staff, yes, that's fine and bring it up here and then change our minds does not seem to be fair to Staff. I mean, I -- I support the resident who came forward with his concerns, but if we had those concerns in work session, I think they should have been voiced at that point.

MS. CARROLL: I thought that I did voice it during work session. And I'm sorry if I'm miscommunicated to Staff, I do appreciate the two work sessions. I was not in favor all along, and I know that I'm the minority vote. I'm okay with that. I respect the

Commission. I respect each of your votes whether you agree with me or not. It's a no for me.

(Multiple simultaneous speakers.)

MS. LOE: Any additional discussion on this motion. Seeing none, Commissioner Carroll, would you do roll call please.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Burns.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Rushing.

MS. RUSHING: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: No.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Geuea Jones.

MS. JONES: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier.

MS. PLACIER: No.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell.

MS. KIMBELL: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: My vote is no. We have --

MS. LOE: My vote is yes.

MS. CARROLL: Oh, my goodness. Chairperson Loe, your vote is yes. I'm so sorry, it's getting late. We have six votes to approve and three to deny. The motion carries.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: Amendment A3 does not have a 75 percent vote approval by the Planning Commission. As such it will be placed individually under Old Business of the City Council. Is it the prerogative of the Planning Commission to request that staff place all three text amendments under Old Business if so directed. Is that the desire of the Commission or do you want them as A1 and A2 moving forward individually and broader discussion at Council level on only A3?

MS. BURNS: That would be my vote, A3 only placed on Old Business.

MR. ZENNER: Thumbs up?

(Unanimous thumbs up.)

MR. ZENNER: Clear indication. A3 will be placed under old business on the Council agenda. All other amendments have been approved unanimously and, therefore, will be on the consent agenda.

Motion One. . In the matter of Case 24-2022, Amendment to the UDC, number A1, revision of Section 29-1.11, Definitions for light vehicle service or repair and gas station or fueling center, move to approve. VOTING YES: Stanton, Burns, Rushing, MacMann, Geuea Jones, Placier, Kimbell, Carroll, Loe VOTING NO: None. Motion carries

Motion Two. In the matter of Case 24-2022, UDC amendment number A2, revision of Section 29-3.2, Permitted-Use Table and Section 29-3.3, Use-Specific Standards, move to approve. VOTING YES: Stanton, Burns, Rushing, MacMann, Geuea Jones, Placier, Kimbell, Carroll, Loe VOTING NO: None. Motion carries

Motion Three. In the matter of Case 24-2022, UDC amendment number A3, revision of Section 29-4.3, Parking and Loading requiring parking for light vehicle service and repair and gas station or fueling center as well as revision of Section 29-4.3(b)(1) to remove "and maximum" from the provision, move to approve. VOTING YES: Stanton, Burns, Rushing, Geuea Jones, Kimbell, Loe VOTING NO: MacMann, Placier, Carroll. Motion carries 6-3.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. LOE: All right. That brings us the end of our meeting. Public comments.

VII. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Moving on to staff comments. Mr. Zenner, you promised us a few.

MR. ZENNER: I did. And maybe make this more entertaining for you. You do have a meeting on December 9 and as we discussed in work session, for the public's edification and maybe listening interest, we will be having an initial discussion as it relates to public outreach and engagement programming for our forthcoming update to the 2013 Columbia Imagine Comprehensive plan. It will be a preliminary discussion of research findings that our staff has compiled at this point on best practices for having an engaged and robust public communication process and will be given by Bill Canton, our public communications coordinator in our office as well as Mr. Kelly. They will be spearheading that end of the activity. It is in preparation for activities that will occur more late first quarter, probably mid-year 2022. However, we would like to get feedback from the Commission at this point should we need to do additional research and come back with a revised or adjusted engagement plan that we would like to utilize. So that will be principle topic. We will also will be having your standard holiday meal. This will be our last meeting of the calendar year, so come with a hungry stomach because we will have a good spread as usual. But unfortunately, I have to drop the bad news on you. We have been holding back. And, you know, it comes this time every year. I'm going to be the Grinch and I'm going to show you four cases. You think, this looks like a wonderful agenda. We have a number of things here, however, that are deceiving. You have a final plat off of Chapel Hill. This is basically to create a legal lot for what is a developed parcel multi-family building. That's a 2212 Chapel Hill. We have your favorite perennial coming

back, 205 East Green Meadows. It is a new preliminary plat on a pointed parcel at the triangle to Green Meadows, the only two locations we have at Green Meadows that intersect together. It is a single-family residential subdivision containing, if I'm not incorrect, six residential single-family lots, all of which have their faces towards the Green Meadows with an access off of Green Meadows Circle. So we get to have a discussion about that. It is not a planned district rezoning request. They have succeeded apparently in meeting our regulatory standards. But we are still in review, so that'll be coming to you. I guarantee you we'll have neighborhood input on that one. And then we have another final plat off of Lakeview Avenue. This is out by the power plant and our maintenance facilities. This is again a plat to establish legal lot status. It is a deed-described lot only, came out of a much larger parcel and, therefore, requires Planning Commission activity. And then we have Quarry Heights, plat number seven. This is an unaddressed parcel on Rollins Road. It will have the title Quarry Heights on it and it is a final plat. Contains two parcels. They'll be merged into a single development lot when we were done, so it is also something that is needing the Planning Commission's approval since it has not previously been approved. Move forward in the right direction. So here are your parcels. Our Chapel Hill Cottages final plat. That is the developed parcel across from Cedar Crest, the assisted living facility on Chapel Hill just above where the entrance is to the park. Then we have out 305 Green Meadows Drive, our perennial favorite for residential development. Then you have our Lakeview plat, and you will notice the large parking lot to the east. That is the Grissum Building parking lot, our city maintenance facility parking lot. And then our Quarry Heights plat here off of Rollins and right at the curve before you get to West, if I recall correctly. And this is currently two parcels that are going to be merged together into a single property. But wait. There's more. There's an entire second page. And we'll even sell you the Ginsu knife set so you can actually cut the ham at your Christmas dinner. But we have further we have --

(Multiple simultaneous speakers.)

MR. ZENNER: See, I'm slick here. I know how to get you all excited. We have more. So we have a series of projects that require design adjustments and interspersed in that first batch is one that's a permanent zoning request. We have 5201 Grace Lane. This will be a proposed, if I'm not incorrect, 112-lot single-family subdivision, does not provide right-of-way for the Stadium extension that is shown on an adopted and approved federal EIS and on a master roadway plan. And then we move into Scott Boulevard across from the more recently annexed parcel, a permanent zoning request on the west side of Scott Boulevard backing up to the Creeks Edge development. This is proposed to

be developed into a four-lot subdivision sharing a common access point which is the subject of Case NO. 3122 and the design adjustment is to allow for a driveway access onto a restricted roadway. And yet there's more. And then we get into all of our planned district plans or revisions. And so we have a new plan and an SOI revision off of Richland Road, just a stone's thrown away from our Grace Lane project which is proposing a storage facility for RVs in an entirely enclosed facility, and therefore, they are requesting a statement of intent revision to allow for a modification to the height of the proposed structures. We have the revision that Mr. Crockett referred to tonight down at Endeavor which will be north of what we just considered this evening in the Kitchen. That is a PD plan revision. No statement of intent change there, just a plan revision. And then we have another PD plan revision out at what is referred to as the Brooks Plat 1 off of Hoylake Drive. And Hoylake Drive actually is accessible from both WW across from where the stoplight is there where the newest gas station is built out in that neck of the woods where the Elks Lodge is, Elk Park Drive, thank you, and it ties back into Rolling Hills. And the section that we are actually talking about this plan revision for refers to where the interconnection between original Plat 1, the Brooks Plat 1 exists which is in a northern section of the development and the new section that was annexed into the City and has been developed with two phases, a third phase which is currently in plan review as a final plat to the south of that. And that is the piece where Hoylake Drive actually extends all the way down to the intersection of WW and Elk Park Drive. Here are your maps. Those are proposed Villages of Rolling Hills. The road alignment goes through about the middle of the lake and plan at this point does not include that road alignment and, therefore, is seeking a design adjustment to avoid having to plat it. The two maps to your right then represent the two different actions that we have for 5025 Scott Boulevard, one for permanent zoning, and the other for the preliminary plat and design adjustment. And then the last three projects that we have are PS Storage. This is the PD plan at the corner of Grace Lane and Richland Road. And then Rolling Hills is the roadway that extends to the south. This will have a PD plan for the first time on this property and an SOI revision. And as I indicated, this is for RV storage, indoor RV storage. Revision to the Discovery Park, Endeavor Center west PD plan. This incorporates changes to the land-use mixture within the existing PD plan and a change in the building form if I'm not incorrect. And then our last project being the revision to Woods Edge which is what it -- was originally named, this northern section that's highlighted in red, now known to us as the Brooks Plat 1 since the project has been renamed and branded. And the amendment specifically deals with the area down here in its very southwest corner before it joins into what is commonly known by the annexation in the platting as the Brooks. So those are

your ten cases. What I can tell you is we shaved a case off before I came to you this evening or we would have had 11. We will try not to feed you too heavy a meal, though that may be my purposeful attempt, and we will have coffee for you that evening as well. Happy holidays. You will enjoy having the rest of the month off.

MS. LOE: There we go. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: All we have to offer.

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Commissioner comments.

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE - December 9, 2021 @ 7 pm (tentative)

X. ADJOURNMENT

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Move to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Seconded by I'm going to say Commissioner Stanton.

(Meeting concluded at 9:40 p.m.)