



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 9, 2022
7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Columbia City Hall
Council Chambers
701 E. Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. LOE: I will call the June 9th, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. LOE: May we have roll call, please, Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Present.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Rushing?

(No audible response.)

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Present.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: Here.

MS. CARROLL: I am here. Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Welcome. And Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

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

MS. LOE: Thank you.

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

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

MS. LOE: Thank you. I'll take a motion on the agenda.

MR. STANTON: I move to approve the agenda.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner MacMann.

I'll take a thumbs up on the agenda.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: It looks unanimous. Thanks, everybody.

Move to approve the agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 19, 2022 Regular Meeting

MS. LOE: Everyone should have received a copy of the May 19th regular meeting minutes. Were there any additions or modifications to the minutes?

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton.

I'll take a thumbs up approval on the minutes.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: Unanimous. Thank you.

Move to approve.

V. TABLING REQUESTS

Case # 164-2022

A request by Engineering Survey and Services (agent) on behalf of Somerset Village Development, LLC (owner) for approval of a development plan and preliminary plat. The preliminary plat proposes three lots. The PD Plan, located on lot 2, proposes two 3-story multi-family structures, a community building, and associated parking. The 17.3-acre site is zoned Planned Development and is located northeast of the intersection of Battle Avenue and St. Charles Road. **(A request to table this project to the June 23, 2022 Planning Commission meeting has been received).**

MS. LOE: Are there any staff comments?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not. As you can see in the correspondence that was

provided by the applicant, there was a question arising in regards to the required parking lot landscaping standards that needed to be applied, along with several other technical questions that still needed to be answered. And after consulting with the staff project manager, it was determined that a tabling for the period of one meeting was essential in order to address those outstanding items. Therefore, they have requested only a tabling to the June 23rd meeting, and that is, in our estimation, along with the applicant, sufficient time to take care of the technical comments.

MS. LOE: Was this case advertised for tonight?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, it was. And that is why it is a formal request for a tabling.

MS. LOE: All right. Thank you. Any questions of staff? Seeing none. Since this was advertised, we will open the floor for any public comments on the tabling.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If anyone has any comments they would like to make, you're welcome to come up to the podium. If there's not, we'll close public comment on tabling.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission comment? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners have no comments or concerns, I move to table Somerset Village, Case 164-2022, until date certain 23 June 2022.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. We have a motion for tabling on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Seeing none. May we have roll call, please, Ms. Carroll.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

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

MS. LOE: Thank you.

Move to table Somerset Village, Case 164-2022, until date certain 23 June 2022.

Yes: 9 - Burns, Loe, Stanton, MacMann, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Kimbell, Placier and Wilson

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 109-2022

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Lyon Crest Properties, LLC (owners), seeking approval of a major amendment to the "Cotswold Villas at Bluff Creek Estates PUD Plan" and a design adjustment to Section 29-5.1 of the UDC relating to development access. The proposed revision will re-name the existing PD Plan to "PD Planned

Development of Bluff Creek Estates, Plat No. 8" and includes proposed revisions that modify the lot arrangement and internal roadway network, and a revised statement of intent (SOI). The revised PD plan contains a total of 36-single-family lots and is consistent with the prior plan approval. **(This request was tabled at the April 7, 2022 Planning Commission meeting).**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends:

1. Approve the requested design adjustment for more than 30 lots accessed from a single point of ingress/egress; and
2. Approve the "Bluff Creek Estates, Plat No. 8 PD Plan," and the associated revised Statement of Intent.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Before we move on to questions for staff, I would like to ask any Commissioners who have had any ex parte related 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. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. Mr. Palmer, I have one question about the sprinkler system. That's a new thing. So having been on this Commission for almost ten years, this is the first that I'm hearing about this. This is -- can you explain just a little bit more about the -- the discussion and decision about that?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. As I said, the fire code is a bit of a new version. I believe this was an addition in that. And basically, it goes along with the access -- the emergency access issue. And so now, basically, the fire code reads that if over 30 lots are accessed from a single point, all of the homes within -- within that have to be sprinkled. It's just a second layer of -- of protection for them. And in this case, like I said, they are well over the 30, and kind of as a mitigation, the applicant offered to sprinkle the homes, which, you know, really would have been required, but then the Code actually goes further to say that all of the homes have to be sprinkled. And so, you know, retroactively, fitting all of those homes is not really an option, so hence the BCCC granted that waiver.

MS. BURNS: Thank you for the additional information.

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Obviously, interim Chief White spent a lot of time with this. Are these turnarounds big enough for their new trucks? Is that -- will there be a problem with that?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Being looped streets, they're actually much larger than the standard.

MR. MACMANN: My concern was not just -- I mean, I noticed the spacing was good, but where our secondary parking is on-the-street parking.

MR. PALMER: Right.

MR. MACMANN: So that -- that was my concern. I was wondering if, you know, Chief White put that in his -- in his calculus or not.

MR. PALMER: I don't know that Chief White did, but their -- their review staff definitely did. They had intimate knowledge of what was going on here and --

MR. MACMANN: But they didn't raise any flags. That was my concern. I mean --

MR. PALMER: There was -- there were some discussions early on about how to address those types of issues, and -- and this design is the result of that conversation.

MR. MACMANN: I will ask you a bit of a radical question. And this is for future reference because we -- this might come up again; i.e. Commissioner Burns' comment. Couldn't giving a new PD on this, a new plat, have resolved the issue, rather than giving an exception? You know, so we have some not sprinkled, some sprinkled?

MR. ZENNER No. So as Mr. Palmer has described this, the fire code is broken into two different parts. The issue at hand specific to this development is that it has over 30 lots or units being served off of a single point of access. In 2017, and if I am not incorrect, in 2018, when we adopted the fire code, the fire code and UDC were aligned to be that no residential development or no development could have over 30 lots off of a single point. The Code is always read that the fire official has the authority to grant exception to that rule. And so the application of utilizing residential fire sprinkling systems, while new to this Commission, is not a tool that has not previously existed under either set of regulations over 100 or now over 30. So the applicant, understanding that they wanted a development initially of 39 units, knew that they were going to have to seek some type of relief from the fire service, volunteered to provide the residential fire sprinklers to address the issue of their development specifically as shown before you. However, the fire code further reads as it was analyzed by the fire marshal's office, that the development as a whole also counts towards a maximum of 30 lots or units accessed off of a single point of access, and the way that the fire code was interpreted by the fire officials was all remaining built structures within Bluff Creek would also need to be sprinkled, an expectation beyond the reach of this applicant and generally beyond the reach reasonably for the City to ask 100-plus homes to retrofit them to sprinkle. Therefore, they went to the Board of Construction and Code Appeals and sought their variance that they received from them to waive the entire development requirement, as

well as to substitute a secondary point of access in lieu of the fire sprinklering in this specific development, which was granted. So the fire service is supportive of this project based on the unique condition that these 36 units will be sprinkled and based on the fact that the Board of Construction Code Appeals approved the overriding Bluff Creek variance for all homes to be sprinkled.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? If not, I have a couple of questions, Mr. Palmer. One, just for my information, but how would the cul-de-sac to the north on Pebble Creek Place be measured. Do you take that from Pebble Creek Way, or do you take it from Dursley Loop?

MR. PALMER: In terms of fire access, you mean?

MS. LOE: In terms of our subdivision limits.

MR. PALMER: I believe it would be from the nearest cross street, which would be the Dursley Loop, I believe.

MR. ZENNER: Or right where the cursor is right now on the screen.

MR. PALMER: And that would provide, basically, a T-turnaround.

MS. LOE: I can't see that.

MR. PALMER: Sorry.

MS. LOE: We're having that cursor problem again.

MR. PALMER: The center -- the center loop to the north. That would be the center loop there.

MS. LOE: There we go. All right. All right. And then another question. We just went through a street renaming exercise, and I was curious. We, on this proposed plat, there's a Dursley Creek Place and then a -- or I'm sorry -- a Pebble Creek Place and a Pebble Creek Way. I thought we just were told that we couldn't have two streets with similar --

MR. PALMER: So there's a standard that's -- the suffix changes based on the -- the design of the street. So you can have, you know, a Walnut Street and a Walnut Court, and a Walnut Court would be a cul-de-sac, typically, as an example, and I believe that's what's at play here is you have an extension of Pebble Creek Court becomes -- yeah.

MS. LOE: I understand that. But I thought we tried to avoid having names of streets with the same name at the front so that there would be less confusion -- I understand there's probably no addresses off of Pebble Creek Way, but if you could just refresh my memory on what we try to avoid with names.

MR. ZENNER: Joint Communications reviewed the street names, so let me just -- I'll leave it at that, and they didn't complain.

MS. LOE: All right.

MR. ZENNER: So the applicant didn't propose any additional street names. And that's -- we rely on them in order to provide us the commentary as to it. And in this instance, I think it's as consistent as inconsistent can be.

MS. LOE: All right. I'm going to hold you to that, Mr. Zenner. Okay. Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open up the floor to public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If anyone has any comments they would like to make, please give your name and address for the record. We do give you three minutes to speak. If you're speaking for a group, we allow you six minutes.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you. Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineer, 1000 West Nifong. With me tonight is Shelley Ravapudi, who is the -- the applicant and developer for this piece of this property. She is a resident of the Bluff Creek neighborhood adjacent to this piece of property, close by to this piece of property, so she knows it fairly well. I believe that Mr. Palmer did a very thorough staff report, but we'll -- a quick little overview. Again, we're looking at 6.7 acres of a piece of property that's already been platted. It's currently zoned PD. We're obviously asking for a modification to the existing Statement of Intent, as well as a new PD plan for that property. Again, you've seen the plan itself. This is the previous plan. You can kind of see in our eyes that the proposed plan is -- is superior in several different -- several different ways. The intent for this piece of property is to do smaller lots, smaller homes, but we don't want to change really the character of the neighborhood. We still want nice homes. We still want some character with the homes themselves. And so these are some renderings that my client has had done for this specific development. So these are homes that she is looking at constructing within the development itself. And so you can kind of see that the architectural feel is still there, so that's what she's looking for. Just because they're smaller lots on -- smaller homes doesn't mean that they're going to take away from the existing neighborhood. Again, the property was zoned 01 as the -- with the overall development of the Bluff Creek neighborhood, rezoned P -- PUD or PD in 2014. Again, Mr. Palmer went through all this, so I won't reiterate. But it went from 44 units to 39, now to 36, and we've also taken out some additional uses in that Statement of Intent at the request of the neighborhood. Here's a quick little zoning map. You can kind of see right in the middle, the gray area, the gray hatched area, is the piece of property that's in question. Directly to the south of this piece of property is M-OF, as well as to the north. Both of those are office zoned tracts. To the south, it's being used as office. To the north, it's owned by the City of Columbia. On the other side of the bridge,

obviously, you have your C -- M-C and M-N on the other side of Grindstone, but then to the east side of this property, this property abuts right up against Highway 63 and across 63 is the industrial development of low-end industrial. The traffic on this piece of property, there have been some concerns with regards to how much traffic this development is going to produce, but it's going to produce significantly less than some of the other previous proposals. The -- the Bluff Creek Drive was originally designed and constructed as a 38-foot-wide curb and gutter street. Thirty-eight foot, at the time, they just had collector, they didn't have major and minor collectors or neighborhood collectors. It's classified as a neighborhood, but honestly, a 38-foot-wide street would be in the classification of a major collector, so it can handle the traffic. The existing roadway intersections -- and intersections have capacity, so there shouldn't be any issues there, and, of course, the street was designed to handle much more traffic originally as it was zoned for office. Utilities, of course, we're inside the urban service area. Obviously, all City services will be provided for sewer, water, and electric. Stormwater, we're going to address the stormwater like we would on most other projects. This development does have a -- have a place holder, if you will, for a certain limited amount of impervious surface, but we're not going to flood downstream properties. We're going to make sure that we cannot do that. We're going to address those concerns. We're going to develop according to the conceptual stormwater management plan, and we're not going to discharge water onto Pebble Creek Drive or Deer Creek Court. I think some of the neighbors had some concerns downstream that this development is uphill from us, and we're going to discharge our water into the streets and inundate those streets. The way that this piece of property lays, the water will go around, and the City wouldn't allow us to discharge water onto those streets anyway. We're very limited on how much water can go onto the streets, and if there is a little bit, which there may be, it's going to go in the gutter that goes down to Gans Creek and not across the street, so those concerns can easily be -- be addressed with our final stormwater plan. Columbia Imagined, again, you know, residential neighborhoods and proximities to school, we're not super close, but we are in the vicinity of the elementary school. Access to commercial services, right down Bluff Creek Drive, commercial services. Access to open space, just to the north of us is the City trail along Grindstone. This piece of property has direct access to that, with -- as well as the recreational facilities. The Columbia Imagined also talks about support of diverse and inclusive housing options. This is diverse. It's different than what's out there. And mixed uses, I think that this development itself, while it doesn't have mixed uses, it's a component of the whole area that does have mixed uses, with office and varying types of residential. The design adjustment, I believe that Mr. Palmer went into good detail

about this, and so I won't hash this out too much, but the -- the issue with residential sprinkler systems is mentioned in the fire code, so it's not -- it's not something that we're coming up with ourselves. It's been used before in other locations and other developments, maybe not in Columbia, but we've used them in other locations, and it is a tool that's listed in the -- in the fire code that says if you go over 30, then we want you to do this. So it's certainly nothing that we were proposing, that we were just coming up with, it's an actual item in the Code. So in conclusion, the proposed development is consistent with the goals and objections of Columbia Imagined. The plan allows for diverse housing options within this portion of Columbia. You know, the plan is significantly consistent with the previously approved plans, and improves on site circulation, parking, and public safety. I think that's important. Again, the fire department has reviewed this plan. They reviewed our turning radiuses, and our accesses and all of that, and they've approved it. And then it comes with you -- it comes before you tonight with, of course, with the support from City staff. And with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I do have a question because I didn't see the answer in your presentation. So I did see the obvious diversity, which is it's a villa, so that's a different type of housing, but there was also the necessity of inclusion, and what's the definition of inclusion, and how are you meeting that?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, in this piece of property, we're -- we are looking at different housing type. It's going to be a smaller -- smaller lot, smaller house. We're not getting down to what -- it depends upon what the -- what the definition of affordability is. Everyone has a different definition, but we're not getting to that -- that price point. We can't get down that low. So we are -- when I say diversity, we are looking a different housing option that doesn't exist in this location, and so that's what we're looking for.

MS. WILSON: So we're meeting diversity, but not inclusivity?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, in -- it depends on what your definition of -- you know, when we say inclusive, are we talking about, you know, what -- what price point are we hitting at. And I think that the way the market is and the way this piece of property situates, and with regards to making concessions with the neighbors with regards to building materials and building types and architectural feel, I think these homes are probably going to be, you know, a little higher point than -- than what we typically would see in -- in a smaller development like this.

MS. WILSON: Thanks.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Crockett, in regards to the smaller lots, I spent, as many of you know, several years on - (inaudible) -- where the lots are even smaller than this, folks. As far as a development, I'm interested in how this goes, because normally when we go smaller, we go cheaper, but I appreciate for all the conditions or the requirements you had to meet, we're not going to hit any kind of price point. A question I had and I -- this may be a question more for people who were - requested it of you. The amenities were eliminated?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, sir.

MR. MACMANN: Let's -- can you talk me through that a little bit?

MR. CROCKETT: I believe that the belief on the part of the residents, that if we included swimming pools and club houses and maintenance field buildings --

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MR. CROCKETT: -- that gave the impression of a rental neighborhood or a student housing complex of some form or fashion, and I believe that they had grave concerns about that. We left them in for quite some time, but that was always a continual sticking point. And so given the fact that we were not proposing them on this PUD plan, we elected to -- excuse me -- PD plan, we elected to remove them since they really didn't apply to our plan itself. But I think that was the reason -- they can speak a little bit more to that -- to that degree, but we had it in there for quite some time, and then we removed it toward the end.

MR. MACMANN: And the last question is, because you're a civil engineer, it intrigues me because I have looked on these small lots before, and where I lived, we had a lot of stormwater issues. Has this presented any unique problems with you?

MR. CROCKETT: No. It doesn't have any unique situation with regards to stormwater. The City of Columbia also has a regulation that is -- and I won't say it's relatively new, but it's, you know, with the new stormwater regulations, that we have to provide stormwater conduit every -- a box with -- for every six lots. And so it allows us and affords us the opportunity to do much more grading and allows us to -- to concentrate flow and then alleviate a lot of the concerns that we have on the -- the older developments that go for blocks and blocks with no stormwater.

MR. MACMANN: Right. All right. I just -- I just wanted to touch on that because this - I'm really following this because it is --

MR. CROCKETT: Oh, absolutely.

MR. MACMANN: -- in direction to Commissioner Wilson's point, making these lots

smaller to make them more affordable, to make them actually inclusive, these are going to be probably twice what would be an inclusive price point, just to see how the engineering works out over time. All right. Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you, sir.

MS. LOE: Commissioner --

MS. WILSON: I'm sorry. I've got a follow-up question.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. WILSON: So removing the amenities, did it make it cheaper?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, we never -- we never proposed them to start with, so they never were included in the original plan, so they didn't make our plan cheaper. They were just -- those items were listed on the previous Statement of Intent. And so when we modified the Statement of Intent, we just modified the items that directly affected what we technically changed. Since we didn't have those, we didn't change them. The previous plan didn't have them, either. We didn't eliminate them. And so then really the Statement of Intent is kind of a guideline. A lot of times, the Statement of Intent will allow us to have more -- allow us to do more things than what the plan itself calls for. And so we can modify a plan in conjunction with the Statement of Intent. So if we were to come back with a swimming pool or a clubhouse, it would be in the Statement of Intent, we would come back with a revised plan. In this case, we would come back with a revised plan and a revised Statement of Intent. So, yes, they were eliminated, but only because they were on the original plan -- on the original statement that never were removed. I don't know if I confused you on that, ma'am, but --

MS. WILSON: I'm not confused. I followed it.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: However --

MR. CROCKETT: Sorry about that.

MS. WILSON: However, you know, in planning, I'm certain that the price point with the amenities was considered. So it would seem to me that once you removed them, then there should be some reconsideration.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, they never were considered because they never were proposed. They never were a part of the actual plan. We never -- we never had a swimming pool or a clubhouse or those amenities on the actual plan itself. The items weren't removed from the plan, just the allowed uses in the Statement of Intent were removed. So those items were never actually on the -- on our proposal.

MS. WILSON: I understand. Okay.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: So, yeah. From the first time I think we saw this, I never thought that this would be anything close to affordable. This feels to me very much like Old Hawthorne or County Club of Missouri where you've got larger houses, you've got smaller houses, but they're all kind of in that same level of, you know, not furnishings -- furnishings -- finishing is the word I'm looking for, the same level of finishings, the same level of architecture materials, things like that. So I guess my question is, am I thinking about this the right way where you're -- you're kind of doing similar to what they did in Old Hawthorne where they have some large houses, and then they have a smaller area?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, I believe that's correct. Yes, ma'am. Because the homes across the street and the other portions of Bluff Creek, they -- they're anywhere from 2,000 square feet to 6,000, 8,000 square feet in size. Obviously, we can't get nearly that size on this piece of property, so we're thinking a smaller home, more in the 1,600, 1,700, 2,000, maybe if you did a story and a half, maybe 2,100, 2,200 square feet, something along those lines, but keep it on that smaller scale, just with the nice finishings. That's correct. Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And you're using the word villas, but these are not maintained yards; right? That three's not going to be -- you have a homeowners association or something that comes and mows everyone's lawns for them. They're -- it's still going to be owner upkeep; is that right?

MR. CROCKETT: That's our intent, yes. We'd like to sell them, yes, for homeowner use.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

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

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case?

MR. COX: My name is Sean Cox; I live at 2705 Pebble Creek Drive. Am I allowed to ask for a point of clarification? The waiver that was granted for the sprinkler systems, and that says that the existing homes do not need to be sprinklered is what we're calling it -- sprinklered? They don't have to have fire suppression systems. However, do any future homes that are built, will that be required of them?

MR. ZENNER: It is my understanding, based on the waiver that was granted by the Building Construction Codes Commission, no. It was applicable to the entire Bluff Creek development and all of the lots platted thereof today.

MR. COX: So any vacant lots that are still existing that have plans to be built on, that would not be required of those lots?

MR. ZENNER: That is my understanding of how that waiver was granted.

MR. COX: Thank you. I appreciate that. As I said, my name is Sean Cox; I live at Bluff Creek, 2705 Pebble Creek. I stand before you as one of the many opponents. I don't have a PowerPoint system, I apologize to the Council on building development.

MS. LOE: Mr. Cox? I'm sorry. Can you just move the microphone down so -- thank you.

MR. COX: Sure. Sorry. Yeah. Since its removal in March 2022, we've had multiple delays in being able to express our opposition to Ms. Ravipudi's proposed plans. These delays, however, have allowed the homeowners to have an actual meeting, an annual meeting, and to meet with Ms. Ravipudi, something that should have been done sooner. I do not need to reiterate the many points of opposition that you all have in front of you from the many neighbors of Bluff Creek, nor do I need to read out the letter from the Bluff Creek HOA, which you also have, that has unanimously opposed this project. What I am going to state is the lack of effort put forth by Ms. Ravipudi to address or take into consideration these concerns. Rather than rectifying her proposal to address concerns, Ms. Ravipudi has been more concerned with garnering letters of support, some of which, I might add, are from homeowners whose houses are currently on the market. I will also wager that there will be more homeowners who put their house on the market if this proposal is approved. It is interesting that on the docket tonight, the second item on the docket is also in Bluff Creek, a proposal to build one residence on six acres as opposed to this one, which is 36 houses on eight acres. These two properties are less than 50 feet apart. Proposed Cotswold Villas development is not conducive with the existing Bluff Creek neighborhood and is a design that is set to gain maximum profit. Its effects will be detrimental. As I was sitting there listening to Mr. Crockett, he brought up a couple of good things which we didn't have answers to last month, stormwater and a few other items which are valuable information. One of the things that was brought up was affordable. It's been answered, it's been asked by a couple of committee members here. It was on the previous staff report that this would be unique affordable home sites. It's not on there anymore, and I think the reason it's not on there anymore is because they're not going to be affordable. The owner developer herself has stated that these will be the \$500,000 to \$600,000 range. The U.S. Housing Authority states -- I have a little bit of a construction background -- states that the median affordability is about \$280,000, so we are well beyond that. It will not be diverse. It will not be inclusive. It will also not fit the existing neighborhood. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner

MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Sir, could you help me understand what you would think would be more appropriate for the neighborhood on this property?

MR. COX: I think it could have been developed in a way that was consistent with the existing neighborhood.

MR. MACMANN: Well, could you help me with what that means? Is that bigger lots, bigger houses?

MR. COX: It's lesser density. There is not a lot in Bluff Creek currently that is less than one-third of an acre. These -- this proposal has lots of a tenth of an acre, so the lot sizes are greatly reduced as by the request to reduce the setback lines. So I feel that had we stayed more consistent with the existing neighborhood, we probably could be in a different place right now. I haven't seen the next item on the docket, but I don't think you got too many letters of opposition for that one.

MR. MACMANN: No.

MR. COX: Yeah, I didn't --

MR. MACMANN: Let me ask you one more question. This is not necessarily directed at you, per se, but you live there, you've said you have a construction background. We will probably -- we're starting to see this across the United States right now -- see smaller lots and cheaper houses so people can afford to buy them. In that -- this may be the case. I guess my question is as follows: Because we may be seeing more of this, where should we put those homes that are on the smaller lots and the cheaper prices?

MR. COX: I moved here from Raleigh, North Carolina, and I've been very --

MR. MACMANN: I spent six years out there. Okay.

MR. COX: -- I am very familiar with this problem. I do not know this area enough to say where that should be. I am just looking at the interests of the neighborhood that I currently live in, and I don't think this is going to help the neighborhood, and I don't think it's going to help your question, because these are not going to be affordable when we're looking at what this --

MR. MACMANN: One eight-five is our number here, by the way. About \$185,000 is an affordable home here. But \$280,000 is reachable for working -- yeah. Anyway, we digress. I'm taking your time and your neighbors' time. Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate your allowance.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Mr. Cox, do you have an idea what the average home price on Pebble Creek and Deer Creek is for the existing homes?

MR. COX: I do not. There are three houses that are currently on the market within close proximity to this. One of them just went on the market yesterday for \$1.2 million. There is another one directly across the street that's on the market for \$1.2 million, and there is one around the corner on Deer Creek, which was \$1.3 million. It may have been reduced recently. The house directly across from this that will probably be the most affected by this, is Dr. Cardwell, and he purchased his three years ago for one point something.

MS. BURNS: So to follow up, you -- and, again, I know you're not a realtor listing these properties, but people can ask whatever they like for a property. Do you know what sales in the past year or two years have been on average for Pebble Creek and Deer Creek?

MR. COX: As a matter of fact, there is a house directly across the street from this that did sell back in March. I don't know the exact amount that it sold for. I believe it went on the market directly across the street for, I think it was around \$500,000, but I don't know the exact number.

MS. BURNS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COX: You're welcome.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would it allay your concerns at all to know that these homes would be priced in the \$500,000 to \$750,000 range?

MR. COX: Would it delay my concerns?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would it allay them? Would you feel better if you knew that?

MR. COX: No. Absolutely I wouldn't. As a matter of fact, I don't feel that that's attainable. We are talking 100 feet from Highway 63. If you had the option of purchasing a \$600,000 home and having a freeway through your backyard, I don't think you would. So I really feel that this is going to probably not bode well for the developer, for the contractor, for the neighborhood. As I said, I believe this is going to be detrimental all around.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you would want -- let's say she did a third of an acre, 24 houses, instead of 36?

MR. COX: I think that would probably be more consistent to the houses that were built in the last couple of years just down the road. There was Horizon Builders, which is, I believe, Sapp built four houses there. They have a buffer area of approximately two acres behind them that runs adjacent to Highway 63 that allows for some type of barrier against the highway. These are going to literally be, as according to the plan when you look at it, they're going to be right up to the setbacks of the highway. I just don't see

\$600,000 being realistic.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Haven't been home shopping lately. I -- I appreciate what you're saying. What I am trying to balance is the concerns of you and your neighbor with the rights of the property owner to do something that is well within our build standards. These are well within cottage standards, I believe. There might be - the five feet maybe slightly off, but, no. This is not an unusual or tight or, you know, overcrowded area, so what I am trying to figure out is what -- what is at the root of the objection.

MR. COX: I think the root of the objection is the density, and that I think the fact that there's an exception to that -- that was given beyond that. As stated, the bridge plan is no longer on the scope of work. It's not in the foreseeable future. So there are other options that, if there was a way to attain a second entrance to go over the 30. If there isn't, and it's not going to be done, why is there an exception to that? Why not keep it at the 30?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure. But that's not a density problem, that's a fire code point of access, and they've reviewed it and said it's safe.

MR. COX: Density problem comes back to what's exactly -- is actually existing in the neighborhood. It's just not conducive to what's there.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COX: Okay.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: So the way that I'm understanding this is that you would like these properties to look the same as your properties and have the same size footprint as your property. Is that what the concern is?

MR. COX: Well, there wasn't an original -- there wasn't an original request that these properties to be part of our HOA. They're not going to be within the covenants or the guidelines of the HOA or the architectural guidelines of the HOA, so it was denied. So, yeah. That would have been fantastic.

MS. CARROLL: So --

MR. COX: That it would adhere to the architectural guidelines of Bluff Creek, that would have been fantastic.

MS. CARROLL: The request, as a follow-up, if I may. The request for them to -- the new properties to be included in the HOA, was that made by the developer or made by yourselves?

MR. COX: Yes. It was made by the developer.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Sure. Thanks.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case?

MR. BLACKMORE: I'm the old guy. I've been in this subdivision -- My name is Charlie Blackmore. I live 2312 Deer Creek Court. There's a line of property that divides my property from the street where this is proposed to be. The first thing I think we need to say is, thank you, Shelley, for taking on this proposal several years ago when we were faced with much worse proposals and not knowing what could go in there because the way it was zoned and the neighborhood was definitely opposed to having another hospital there, rental property, apartments, and such as that. And Shelley and her husband took this on to make our subdivision a better place to -- to kind of stabilize this eight acres and -- and make it better than what we could have had there a long time ago. So again, I say thank you, Shelley, for doing that. And as far as the homeowners or board being opposed to this, I didn't even know they were opposed to it. I thought we were still in the discussion stages, and I would just like to say, you know, it's -- it's been approved, basically, twice, if not three times, with more -- more homes there than -- than we're looking at now. So I just say my hat is off to Shelley and I think we've got a great thing to do here and I think we ought to go with it. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you.

MS. SCHEBEN: My name is Michelle. I live at 2313 Deer Creek Court, and I've worked in property management, as well as been on the HOA board for Mill Creek Manor about ten years ago. So I took the opportunity -- I'm new to Bluff Creek. I looked at the property, and it's much deeper than people realize whenever -- when they look from the front row to Bluff Creek. It's also -- and I've recently moved back from Folsom, California, and in California, whatever, in Folsom, our population was 80,000. It was smaller. And within -- we lived in American River Canyon, and within American River Canyon, we had town homes in a two-mile radius. We had town homes -- we had single-family homes, like what's being proposed to be built, and then there was large estates like Bluff Creek currently has. And then with -- at the top of the hill, whatever, there was apartments, and there was a small shopping complex. So within all that, the homes or whatever were not impacted by the diversity of the homes. And what was the draw is whatever, is people of all incomes whatever could come into the neighborhood, and they could live in a nice place to live whatever, and it met all the -- all the needs of everybody. So that was really a plus, and I don't see a downfall into building this. I have talked to Shelley multiple times. I've also, you know, looked at her plans. She's brought down the home volume or, I guess, the density from 39, you know, she's brought it down. She's made some of the

back lots a little bit bigger. She stressed issues regarding stormwater where also she's looking at, like, including landscaping or whatever that would sound buffer the freeway, so -- so the noise was addressed. She's put a tremendous amount of time, effort, thought in her proposals, and I don't feel that it was kind of a rush decision and kind of thrown together. And I really feel that this is something that's doable. The price point, I'm not aware of it being to what the last gentleman spoke about being in the five hundreds. I thought there would be a four hundred price point, which is consistent with some of the smaller homes that do exist in Bluff Creek. So -- so recently there was a home that sold, I believe, close to around \$450,000, and it falls within that category, so it is consistent. She also has within her plans the backside of the homes that went align to Bluff Creek, would have the same architectural design or whatever as the front side of the home. So -- so those that live in Bluff Creek Estates, when you drive down or whatever, it has the curb appeal. It looks, you know, pleasing. And so she's put a lot of consideration into what all the residents are looking at and what they would like, and that consists of, you know, all her modifications that we've seen. So I would like to say that I do approve this, and I do feel it might not be for everybody, but it also is a stepping point whatever for, you know, single -- single parents or families that don't have children that want a smaller footprint and would like to live in Bluff Creek Estates. You don't need a 6,000 square foot home, so --

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker?

MS. THOMPSON: Michelle, I don't believe we caught your last name.

MS. SCHEBEN: Scheben.

MS. THOMPSON: Scheben. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Michelle.

MS. CLARK: My name is Cristen Clark, and I live at 2688 Bluff Creek Drive. And I wanted to just say a couple things in support of this endeavor, and the gentleman who spoke before me had a different experience. I had a wonderful experience with Shelley coming to me, approaching me, talking to me about this project, answering all of my questions. I thought she did a great job. And I did my research, and I actually do live in one of those smaller homes on Bluff Creek Drive. My home is 24 -- 2,490 square feet. And as she said before me, not everybody has the need or desire to live in a really big home. I live by myself. I obviously do not need a 6,000 square foot home, but I also have worked hard, and feel that if I want to live in a nice neighborhood that's safe, that has guidelines, and that I feel like I'm, you know, going to be in a very nice neighborhood, and the folks who live around me all are very nice and appreciative. And so we do have some smaller homes there, and I want to make sure I had all my notes here. And I think like --

like she said before me, I think these will be a great option for someone like me who wants a safe neighborhood and a nice home without the expense of square footage that a single person just doesn't need. So I support this, and I just thank you for your time.

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

MR. JORDAN: Hello. My name is Dennis Jordan; I live in 5115 Deer Park. So I do not live on Bluff, I do not live on Pebble. I was approached by Shelley a few days ago and she just wanted my knowledge. I'm a local realtor. I've been a realtor for 17 years. Wanted to know about rental. I guess there was a concern with this project about rentals. And for this price point, I think most of these homes are going to be above \$400,000, probably above \$500,000. In my experience in 17 years, I'm not seeing any parents buying rentals for their kids to go to Mizzou in that price point. Everything I see is \$200,000 to \$250,000, \$275,000. New construction prices have gone up a lot, as we all know. Probably looking two to two-twenty a square foot in this neighborhood, so -- minimum. Pebble Creek, I sold in March. That sold for \$475,000. That was kind of a small home over there. Deer Creek, across, 2301 will be on the market in July, and these homes, along with 2401 Bluff Creek is going on the market next week. You're talking 6,000 square feet. A lot of people can't -- you know. They love that neighborhood, but they don't want to maintain that home, so I think this will give them an option to downsize if they want to stay in the neighborhood. That's all I've got.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Jordan. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yes. I was just wondering what your opinion is on whether the -- this new development would affect the home values on the other side of Bluff Creek, or make it a less desirable place to buy?

MR. JORDAN: I -- if there wasn't so much commercial on that street, I would say it could probably have an impact, but you have commercial buildings on that street already, so I think that impact is already there, so --

MS. LOE: I have a question. Homes with smaller lots, is there a trend or interest in buying a home that doesn't have a large lot?

MR. JORDAN: So when I got into the business 17 years ago, you didn't see homes too often under 10,000 square feet, but that's five lots, yeah.

MS. LOE: With lots. Lots, that's --

MR. JORDAN: Sorry.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MS. JORDAN: But in the last probably five years, I'm starting to see the fours, the

fives, and six houses for every -- especially if you have a cul-de-sac. That's the only choice you have because you have a pie. So you have a small front -- road frontage, so that hurts them, and it's hard to avoid that.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. JORDAN: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: Any other -- Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Do you find small lot size, smaller home size at this higher price point to be in demand?

MR. JORDAN: I think this price point is the new price point. I don't think it's -- I think that's just where we're at now. I'm involved in a lot of new construction and you're getting closer to \$450,000 to \$500,000 on slabs, and you're already touching \$600,000 on basements now, so we're at that point, especially south of I-70 for the price of lots.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: I would be in agreement with you. New construction and the prices have gone up. I -- I concur with what he says.

MR. JORDAN: And especially if she's going to decorate the back of these homes to make them appealing, you don't see that in neighborhoods. I -- I don't even know if I've ever seen that, so that's impressive.

MS. KIMBELL: Thank you for showing up.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. RAVIPUDI: Before I begin, can I address a couple of items of misinformation from before?

MS. LOE: Can I get your name and address, please?

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Yeah. I'm Shelly Nelson-Ravipudi. I live at 2317 Deer Creek Court. We anticipate the home prices to be in the range of \$400,000 to \$500,000 based on comps -- recent comps I just pulled from southeast Columbia, new construction, so I just want to make that clear that I'm not saying they're going to be \$600,000 to \$750,000. So, okay. I guess I'll begin now. So I've lived in Bluff Creek for over 18 years and I drive past the site every day to enter and exit the neighborhood. And in 2014, we were -- we received notice that modest rental duplexes were going to be built, and the neighborhood was super upset, but they were very happy when my company, Lyon Crest, purchased the property. Lyon Crest is a local female-owned business. Development, property management is what we do. Our most notable property is -- our most notable property is on Rogers Street across from Jefferson Middle School. All right. Here we go. All right. So this is our development on Rogers Street across from Jefferson Middle School. You see the concept drawing that was used during the design and build

phase. It was constructed in 2016 at the same time the City was working on their Unified Development Code that was passed in 2017. And this project was often referred to as an example of good infill development. And I also want to point out that the facade features were not required in 2016, but the new Code does have additional design features, architectural standards that are somewhat similar to this. So the point I want to make is that Lyon Crest does have a good reputation for quality despite codes and regulations not existing. Also wanted to say that, you know, we have an opportunity at Bluff Creek now for infill development. And, you know, the surrounding land use and -- has informed our purchasing and rezoning decisions, and as you know, we have decreased here three times. Originally zoned O-1, I stripped away a bunch of possible uses, including the potential of 17 multi-family units per acre. So that could be viewed as a 70 percent decrease. And then in 2016, we decreased again by 11 percent and recently, after listening to neighbors, another 8 percent. So we're down to 36 units. The idea is to appeal to the market for the millennials and baby-boomers who are competing for the same product have, you know, these houses that are on small lots, but have a big impact, so they live large despite their square footage. Very nice interiors and minimal yard maintenance. I also want to make the exteriors visually interesting, like you see here on Rogers Street, for the people that are driving by, so there are going to be additional standards for the rears of the homes facing Bluff Creek so that the neighbors like myself are happy. This is not a new plan. We have had this past twice before by P&Z and City Council unanimously with no neighborhood opposition. The only reason I'm here today is because there are some unfortunate life events that occurred including my divorce, and so the lot line has expired. Recently, I have been in front of neighbors twice, Zoom meeting, in person. I've knocked on doors. I've had countless one-on-one conversations, hours and hours with neighbors, and I've listened and addressed all concerns that are within my control. And I do want to say that you have a lot of support letters in your packet, and there's more support out there. And I think that it's really notable that a lot of thought were put into these letters, and they weren't written to me as a favor. So, Michelle, up here earlier was speaking about her experience, you know. And one of the things that she did is she called a realtor. After she decided she supported this project, she called a realtor to see if they would actually sell, because she didn't want empty houses sitting there. So she put in a lot of extra effort to really understand the project and realize it's good for our neighborhood. Another person did his own informal traffic survey. I didn't ask him to do that, but very thoughtful. And so I think that speaks volumes about the support that I do have. So thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Nelson. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner

Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yes. A while back, we had a proposal where the developer wanted to have the backs of houses facing more major streets, and the neighbors opposed because they thought that those homes -- homeowners would put fences all along the street and it would be unsightly, and yet they would want the privacy of the tall fence. What do you think about that dilemma of facing the rear of homes toward a major street where you would also have some critical neighbors?

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Well, we -- we don't really like fences in Bluff Creek, but, oh, in Old Hawthorne, that was brought up earlier along some of the, you know, bigger roads. There are a lot of, you know, nice houses where the rear faces the street, and they have landscaped, and it's grown in over the years and it looks really nice. Also, some of the ideas that I have are, you know, for the back patio, I wanted to do, like, a half-wall, so that, you know, it's just a little more privacy for the people that live there, but then also you don't have to look at maybe poor choices in patio furniture or something. So those are just things that have come to mind, but --

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Shelley, shall I address you as Nelson or Ravipudi? I do not --

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: I just changed to Nelson.

MR. MACMANN: I will -- I will do that then. I'm familiar with your Rogers Street development, and you may not remember me, but you interacted with my former business partner, Daniel Culimore -- do you remember Dan -- quite a bit. Where I'm going with all this is you were a very good neighbor there.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: And -- and what Ms. Nelson said is correct. We used -- and Mr. Stanton will remember this. We used their development as an exemplar on some things that we wanted to do. And you were correct. You were not required -- you were grandfathered in. You were not required to do the things that you did do there. Where I'm going with this is, you've got a good reputation, you did good on Rogers Street. I know this personally. Are you going to be a good neighbor in Bluff Creek? That's where I'm going with this because this is what it boils down to. It's, like, what the --

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Exactly. Yes. I will be a good neighbor and, again, I live in that affected area. I live on Deer Creek Court, and that's why I purchased the property. So, yes, I will be.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Well, you -- so far, you've been a good neighbor on Rogers Street, and I guess that's -- there's a lot of concern and I appreciate people's concern on their very significant investments.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: Not necessarily my life experience, but it is a significant investment and I just -- I hope that you continue to be a good neighbor. Thank you very much.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: You know, I do have some concerns about the properties facing the back to the rest of the developments.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Right.

MS. CARROLL: And we're to this -- as Commissioner Placier brought up, I'm appreciative. I like the idea that you have about a short wall and I'm glad that you've put that thought into this. I guess what's concerning to me is the feel of community. We have a similar development come up south of Broadway over at Green Meadows, I believe, when they were talking about inward facing properties being disjointed from the rest of the community. I just -- I guess that I worry that this -- while it is not an affordable housing option, it is a more affordable price point where someone could -- could buy a house in this community. I guess I'd like to see what your thought was in setting this up. I have a concern that it would, especially given that they're not part of the HOA, that I guess that goal of having the neighborhood more available at a slightly more moderate price point might be negated by separating the two communities esthetically.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Well, we can't really have the houses face Bluff Creek Drive because then we would have -- probably would need to have -- well, I guess we could have rear-loading garages. I don't know. I guess I just always thought about driveways and such, and what will actually work on that property. I really don't have a good answer to that. I'm sorry, but -- yeah. No. I mean, I had an interest in joining the homeowners' association, but there's a lot of objection to that just because the houses are smaller and there's concern about the kind of people that are going to buy smaller houses, so that is a concern, a reason why people want it to be the same as the rest of the neighborhood.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Ms. Nelson.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case?

MR. WADE: Good evening. My name is Tim Wade; I reside at 2104 Bluff Point Drive, which is on the north side of the Grindstone Creek. I had a question about the development along the west wide of the development. Is there access to the Grindstone

Trail? Is there a sidewalk that runs along the east side of the development or is there a fence?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. They're required by the code to construct sidewalk along the entire frontage on Bluff Creek Drive, and then that would further -- their -- their property does not extend all the way north. There's an interceding actual park property there.

MR. WADE: Right.

MR. PALMER: And so they would make the connection to that and then, in the future at some point --

MR. WADE: So there is a sidewalk that runs along the east side of this development?

MR. PALMER: It will be the west side of this development on the --

MR. WADE: Oh, excuse me. West side, yes.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Yeah. On the east side of the street, so there --

MR. WADE: Is there an easement within the development to the City property in order to access the Grindstone Trail? One of the issues that we -- we have on the north side of the Grindstone Trail on Bluff Point Drive is some wonderful property that backs up to the Moss Waters Wildlife Area, but there is no access to the trail system, and that has to do with the fact that the trail was created after the neighborhood was already in place.

MR. PALMER: They're not -- they're not proposing one, but that sidewalk does provide a connection there, so -

MR. BLACKMORE: I have a question.

MS. LOE: I'm sorry, Mr. Blackmore. We can't take questions from the floor, so -- any questions for Mr. Wade? I see none. Any additional questions -- comments on this case? If there are none, we will close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commissioner comment? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Okay. First of all, this has been through some metamorphosis and I do like the way that it's morphed into its current state. The biggest problem -- the biggest problem, don't say affordable ever if you don't mean it ever. Half of our conversation up here is because for some marketing -- this is my perspective -- some marketing tool was used to say that we're going to make these affordable. Do not say affordable if you do not mean it ever. I'd rather you would just be realistic. These are not going to be affordable. Don't say they're affordable. Just don't say it. Not dream it, don't guess it, keep it 100 percent real because half of our conversation was about affordability. The way these small lots -- you're right. The real estate agents that discussed these is

completely right. Smaller lots, less -- less yardage, that's -- that's the market. We understand the market is -- is very active right now. Four hundred, five hundred thousand dollars for these houses is realistic. This is a capitalist, this is an entrepreneur endeavor. It is designed to make money. Let's keep it real. Let's make it all real. Do not market it as affordable if it's not real. That's my only problem. Other than that, this is a great design. Just don't blow smoke up our behinds to get -- to get the project across the borderline. Don't say it if we don't mean it, because there's people that will call you out on the -- well, somebody said it. It wasn't some kind of literature, whatever. It got out this way. I heard it. Bottom line is that's why I took this, so do not do it if it's not real. I work in affordable housing space. We would like to -- we like hearing that. We don't like it being a lie, and that's where I'm at. So I have to get on a soapbox. Just for future reference, don't say it if you don't mean it. Everything else is great. It meets the market needs. I think you did what you could to work with the neighbors. There can always be more, but I just had to get that affordability issue out. Don't say it if you don't mean it.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Commissioner Stanton. Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. I'm inclined to support this because I see the success of developments like County Club Villas out by the country club. As Commissioner Geuea Jones mentioned, there are larger -- there are homes that have less yard to take care of. And I see Old Hawthorne being developed in this manner, too. So I have to believe that it's successful, that there's a need for this type of development, and so I am inclined to support this.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I agree with Commissioner Burns. There are a number of recent developments that are similar in this. We have been asking for a variety of housing types and housing sizes. We've discussed cottage standards quite a bit and have been looking for more applications in that range. I do think this is a housing type that is in need in this city and in demand in this city. I'd like to acknowledge the fact that we cannot, with our zoning codes, ensure that all of your neighbors will have the same footprint as you do. That's not a zoning practice that we can do. If this meets our zoning code, then it meets our zoning code. I plan to support this. I think that it is a good plan in general, and I think that it achieves several of the goals that we have in Columbia Imagined.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners do not have any more -- I don't want to jump the gun here, if somebody's got something to say.

MS. LOE: Oh, this is the motion. Okay.

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners do not have any more questions or

concerns, I do not want to jump the gun. In the matter of Case 109-2022, Bluff Creek Estates Plat No. 8, revision of SOI and major PD amendment and associated design adjustments as spelled out in 29-5.1, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. KIMBELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann. I'm going to give the second to Commissioner Kimbell, since, Mr. Stanton, you just beat everyone else to punch up until now. So we have a motion on the floor for approval. Any discussion on this motion? If not, Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

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

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

In the matter of Case 109-2022, Bluff Creek Estates Plat No. 8, revision of SOI and major PD amendment and associated design adjustments as spelled out in 29-5.1, move to approve.

Yes: 9 - Burns, Loe, Stanton, MacMann, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Kimbell, Placier and Wilson

Case # 115-2022

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Jeremy and Michelle Moore (owners), seeking approval of two design adjustments related to sidewalk installation and public improvements, 29-5.1(d) and 29-5.1(g), respectively. The requested design adjustments are sought in connection with a proposed two (2) lot final plat of approximately 6.55-acres of R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) zoned property. The property is located on the west side of Bluff Creek Drive, approximately 200 feet north of the intersection of Bluff Creek Drive and Pebble Creek Court.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Brad Kelley of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested design adjustments to waive grading between the trail and the bridge abutment and to allow sidewalk to be built in an alternative location.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Kelley. Before we move to questions of staff, I'd like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte related to this case to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Hi. Thanks. I'm looking at the alternative -- sidewalk alternative graphic. Am I reading it correctly that it will tie into whatever sidewalk is built at the development that will be across the street? I'm trying to figure out if the property lines I see where the sidewalk on the east side of the street ends, are those property lines or the --

MR. KELLEY: It would -- it would tie in. It's a whichever happens first, so if this development comes through first, they will build all of the sidewalk as shown here. There's a little stretch that overlaps, so if the development across the street builds their portion of sidewalk first, then this will just build the part on the graph that hasn't been built yet.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's what I thought, I just wanted to make sure I was reading it correctly.

MR. KELLEY: Yes. Yeah. Where the cursor is is what -- is the part that would be overlapping on the other part of the development.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Thank you.

MR. KELLEY: But the other -- the other development on the other side of the street.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?'

MR. MACMANN: Just a point, and this may be a Mr. Crockett thing when he gets there. The future bridge abutment is in the flood way or the floodplain? The potential abutment --

MR. KELLEY: I --

MR. MACMANN: You're not sure?

MR. KELLEY: I don't believe so. I believe, as you can see --

MR. MACMANN: It's above that point?

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. If you look here, this is -- I'm going to the other side just so I have north-south oriented. No. That's not going to work for me. Okay. So this hatch line with the hatches facing toward the right of my screen, that is the flood way, I believe, and this is the under your floodplain, so the bridge abutment is outside of that at a higher elevation.

MR. MACMANN: Just wanted to make sure. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. Just to be clear, if the City does at some future date decide to pursue this bridge, does that entail any obligation for the property owner to then do the sidewalk?

MR. KELLEY: For the property owner, no. That would be the City completing that portion of sidewalk.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a quick revisit. See that piece. If it's not on the ten year, it's imaginary, and it's more than aspirational, and I seriously doubt in this neighborhood if this bridge ever gets built unless the neighbors want a bridge. So I think the chances of this bridge or the sidewalk are low.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I concur. I was just going to say that. If you thought ten-, twenty-year plan, it's not. It's not happening.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? If there are none, we will open up the floor to public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If you have any comments, please come up to the podium and 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. Kelley did a good job explaining what I kind of thought originally was a little bit more of a complex situation, but I think he did a very good job, at least it was in my mind, of explaining what's going on here, so I don't want to bore you with a bunch of details and reiterate what he had already said, but the big thing I want to -- I want to talk about is really the applicant is really wanting to build as much as they can, and in this particular case, they just can't. And so that's what they're asking relief from. Many times, you have a -- a variance request coming before you asking for relief because they don't want to do it, and that's not the case here. They're willing to build a sidewalk, they're willing to grade as much as they can. It's just without that bridge abutment in place, we can't go any further. That bridge abutment, the elevation has yet to be determined, and so it's not something that can be built in grade two. Even if it was built in grade two, our sidewalk is going to be elevated so high, it doesn't go anywhere. And so the idea that it is, you know -- you know, my company worked with City Staff to come up with an alternative layout that would be more accommodating, you know, so we can provide sidewalk, maybe not to their standard location, maybe not the full length of the property, but it's going to be used. It's going to allow this development to have access to the trail. I don't know if Mr. Wade is still in the room or not, but I think that was one of the questions that he had at the -- at the last meeting -- or, excuse me -- that last hearing about that, and I think this is going to answer his question. So all the residents would have a better access to the trail down below. And so, again, just want to reiterate, my client is willing to do what they need to do. It's just they don't want to do things that they really can't. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions the

Commission may have.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Hi. I'm going to ask you a series of leading questions for the record. They are not traps. So this -- this property has some pretty unique geographic features.

MR. CROCKETT: The entire piece of property?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, this particular area. It's very steeply graded. It's down into a flood plain?

MR. CROCKETT: There's -- correct. Correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And you are not requesting to build no sidewalk. You do want to build sidewalk?

MR. CROCKETT: That is correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And that sidewalk ties into other public transit sidewalks even though that is a trail rather than a street sidewalk?

MR. CROCKETT: That is correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much.

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

MR. WADE: Tim Wade, 2104 Bluff Point Drive. I've got a picture of what trail access looks like for a developer.

MS. LOE: We need a user-friendly computer.

MR. WADE: Yeah. So I wish I could tell you in words what pictures look like. The - - the opportunity to use 95 more feet of this development for a better surface would be far superior to the -- somebody suggested there's an existing trail there. It's basically a -- that was maybe weed-whacked through the grass, so there are a lot of ticks, there's a lot of rocks, there's a lot of -- it's basically through the middle of the woods. You have an opportunity to get 95 feet closer to an existing trail system, so why not take the opportunity to utilize that extra 95 feet. The developer is willing to do it, I'm sure, because it's a highly valued property. As it ends, the -- you're probably going to end up -- don't worry about it. You're going to have a sidewalk to nowhere that just sort of does a -- turns around. I don't really understand why we're not taking advantage of 95 more feet toward the Grindstone Trail. You know, you can explain to me what -- what a bridge abutment would mean, but as I understand it, 95 more feet of sidewalk would get us 95 feet closer to the existing trail rather than just saying, well, it's not really on the ten-year plan for CIP.

MR. KELLEY: Sure. Yeah. Sure. So going 95 more feet in the typical location

would be actually going away from the trail. I discussed this pretty well at the -- no. And so the trail is actually going to the -- the southern portion of this screen. I'm discussing with the Parks Department --

MR. ZENNER: The lighter area here, Tim, that you see here where the cursor is, that's actually the trail as it comes off --

MR. WADE: That's what I'm saying. That's not a trail. That's a cut back --

MR. KELLEY: It's a deer path. You're right. Yeah.

(Multiple people taking simultaneously.)

MR. ZENNER: And then -- yeah. The green line that is here is really probably the cut trail that the Parks Department has leading down to the creek channel.

MR. KELLEY: On City property, yeah.

MR. ZENNER: City property. That may or may not be improved at some point in the future to something more significant. This design, at least, would get you to that trail on an improved pedestrian system that doesn't exist today, and that is why it's viewed as being more practical than building the sidewalk that's in yellow to a future bridge abutment that has not yet been set.

MR. WADE: Ninety-five closer to an existing trail. I hear this word existing, direct access to the Grindstone Trail, but that's not true. We still are going to end up with development, you know, new development on an existing trail where a cul-de-sac or a dead-end does not access the trail system. That's sort of become a problem in Columbia when, you know, you have an opportunity when you develop the dead-end area that backs up to the trail to give the public access to that trail rather than, okay, we're just going to cut through somebody's backyard and hope they don't yell at me.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I did want to ask some follow-up questions. So can we go back to that graphic, Brad?

MR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: So I do us this trail, actually, a bit. I'm a hiker and a cyclist. When I drove this area, it wasn't clear to me. So when I drove down this street, it wasn't clear to me where the trail access was. However, I'm not clear, listening to you and looking at the graphic, how building the extra 95 feet on the yellow line gets you closer to the trail, either.

MR. WADE: So -

MS. CARROLL: So what are -- I wish I could see the picture that you brought. And riding that trail, I did not know that there was any kind of access here.

MR. WADE: Access is a really incorrect word to use. It's a way to get to the

existing trail.

MS. CARROLL: So how does the yellow get you closer to the trail, though?

MR. WADE: That Bluff Creek Road goes directly across toward Hollywood 14 Theaters, and so you see the -- the Grindstone Trail coming -- coming right in between the two. So you're -- you know, you get 95 feet more if you -- if you basically stayed with a plan to build the sidewalk. I just think we're giving up 95 feet of -- of getting closer to the trail.

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. One thing I was referring to is access, yeah. It's not -- this part is an improved trail, like it's not a paved trail or anything. Right? It's more of a deer path kind of situation as it runs through this hillside, switch backs here, and then crosses at Grindstone Creek. So the proposal would be to construct it up to the point that it comes into City property, where the City has -- lays this rough portion of a trail at the end of their property.

MR. WADE: If the City could give a promise to give a real through access to the Grindstone Trail, I think that would be fine. That ought to be included in the proposals, part of the approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission that we -- we promise or we have -- here's the design. We'll make this a real trail rather than -- you know, I mean, just somebody went and weed-whacked it for this -- you know -- you know, it's -- you need to have access to the Grindstone Trail. That's what this community is billed about. It's -- you know, we've got these trails running through our backyards and no one can get to them because developers who developed the dead end don't allow easements through. So I'm just going to say we've got two opportunities here. The first one, I didn't really hear anything said I'm going to give you access to the -- give you access to the City property, but on a trail to it, to the Grindstone Trail. Why not use this one? It's, you know, closer. I'm just going to make that suggestion. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Wade. Any additional questions for Mr. Wade? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Wade. Mr. Kelley, this plan for the alternative -- any additional public comments?

MR. COX: Again, Shawn Cox, 2705 Pebble Creek Court. I guess if you could go back, Mr. Kelley, to -- I guess I'm confused. If it is not in the plans for the City to make the trail access, and it's my understanding it's not -- it's not on the budget right now, why are we asking this homeowner to extend a sidewalk? We already have issues with homeless individuals living up in that area. We have access with people parking there, trying to get back down this. It is, by no means, a trail. It is literally a deer path that is covered in mud and is extremely dangerous for people to try and go down. So now we're going to extend a sidewalk that's going to present an image that this is going

somewhere. We're going to have people parked there thinking that they can then access it, and we have no plan in place for a trail to be done; is that what I'm understanding?

MS. CARROLL: Not requiring them to build this --

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Sorry. I'm sorry. I just wanted to clarify. We're not requiring them to build this. They're offering this as an alternative to building it in the traditional location.

MR. COX: Okay. So they're offering to build it on the other side --

MS. CARROLL: They offered --

MR. COX: -- but still as Mr. Wade was saying, it's still going to be a road to nowhere. It's just an invitation for problems.

MS. LOE: Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: The developer is required to do the sidewalk as he develops his property, so it was going to be a sidewalk to nowhere, just more nowhere. And if he were to do it, it would have been at great expense because of the elevations and the lack of the bridge above it, which a bridge that is on a 20-plus plan, which means it's not going to be built. So this is an alternative to not having any sidewalk which is required. If he did not ask for this adjustment, he would have to build this monstrous sidewalk basically levitating over extreme elevations and build up probably ten feet of dirt to make it happen. Do you see what I'm saying?

MR. COX: Right.

MR. STANTON: But he's asking for an alternative, and that's why we're in this discussion. He's going to build some versus all that he will be required if he did not come before us and ask us for this adjustment at all.

MR. COX: I understand. I live three houses from there. So my next question then becomes once this is built by the developer, who then does this become responsible -- who is responsible for this thing?

MR. STANTON: The City.

MR. COX: So it will be City property --

MR. STANTON: The City maintains it.

MR. COX: -- to maintain it.

MR. STANTON: Takes custody of it after its built.

MR. COX: Okay. We already have issues with that not being maintained. We have issues with those roads not being plowed during the winter. I can't tell you the number of people I've had to pull out of that neighborhood with my truck. The appearance of that having more access, people come down there thinking that they can access all the way over across to the movie theater. I have numerous people who stop my children, asking

my children how they get to the movie theater. That being extended, the appearance of that sidewalk going -- is going to only exacerbate that, and I just think that if there was going to be a plan to extend the sidewalk, I'd like to see something as was mentioned -- I would like to see something on the plans for the City then to make it an actual access.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for Mr. Cox? I see none at this time. Thank you, Mr. Cox. Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none. I'm going to close public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission comment? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Despite my earlier comments -

MR. MACMANN: Oh, excuse me. Ladies first.

MS. CARROLL: I was going to say you can go first.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carol?

MS. CARROLL: Despite my earlier comments, I think that this sidewalk location makes sense. The other sidewalk is impractical, also goes nowhere. There is no bridge coming. We've all stated this. I think that it would be nice if the City would provide a trail sign there so we knew why it was connecting as users, but that's not part of this request. So I do intend to support this request.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Stanton? Mr. Kelley, the plan for the -- or the design of the revised sidewalk location was looked at by Parks and Rec?

MR. KELLEY: This specific graphic, yes.

MS. LOE: Did they indicate any provisions or plans for tying the trail in, or that this does -- they did identify that this does tie into a trail head?

MR. KELLEY: Yes. This was heavily supported by them. I don't have any info for any other plans for Parks offsite.

MS. LOE: No. But -- but they have identified this as a location that ties into a trail they identify as existing or --

MR. KELLEY: Yes.

MS. LOE: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Now I am confused because I thought that green thing was not -- I guess the white -- whitish curved thing there is the bush-whacked, rough area, but what about the green? Is it actually the trail, or is it access to the trail?

MR. KELLEY: No. This is a little zoomed in. The graphic didn't work well for the dimensions of the TV, I think. I was trying to point out where the trail connection would be, and then pointing out farther to the southeast. The trail runs fairly linear along the contour line right there. If you just imagine extending where you can see it; it's like a

gravel path now where it makes that L-shape. If you just imagine extending on that same path. And you can also see it on the -- when I showed the slope earlier, you can see where there's an area that's at grade continued throughout the hillside.

MR. ZENNER: Notice -- I think you can see this in the graphic. This is the bridge that Mr. Kelley has been referring to that comes over the creek. And as he's referenced, there is a switchback due to the grade change here in this what we would refer to and our Parks and Recreation Department would refer to as a trail. And it is a trail, a hiking trail. This is not an improved by any means access, but it comes and generally is -- follows the topo, and has to come back, and then comes down to get across. This is an undeveloped City property that was acquired several years ago. As is the Parks Department's general practice, as monies become available and ballot initiatives are passed to extend the Parks sales tax and demands or requests are made of them within their neighborhoods in which they have these types of facilities, then improvements may be being proposed or made, but that is not something that was discussed with us at the time that we were looking at this alternative with the Parks Department. No additional information has been provided, but from a practical perspective, the connection of the sidewalk that was shown on the graphic will eliminate, in essence, what you see starting here at the end of pavement all the way down, in essence, to where it goes into the tree line. That becomes a paved surface that then accesses and completes a trail -- the beginnings of a trail network, a traditional paved trail network as you can see here on this graphic, on the north side of the creek.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any additional comments? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners have no more questions or concerns -- Mr. Kelley, before I open my mouth, this is just two design adjustments. Right?

MR. KELLEY: Correct.

MR. MACMANN: Do you want two motions?

MR. KELLEY: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: Could you return to the relevant page so I can read it off. In the matter of Case 115-2022, design adjustments to that particular plat --

MR. ZENNER: Bluff Creek Estates Plat 10.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Bluff Creek Estates Plat 10. I was reading forward before I went back. I move to waive the grading between the trail and future bridge abutment location.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Seeing none. Commissioner

Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

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

MS. LOE: Thank you. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If I may, in the matter of Case 115-2022, Bluff Creek Estates Plat No. 10, design adjustment, allow the sidewalk to be built in an alternative location as demonstrated by staff's report, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Motion on the floor. Any discussion on this motion? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: I hope somebody can explain to me how this alternative sidewalk, it connects to an unmaintained, unmarked trail that is a route to a trail. I'm just trying to think what is the -- what's the long-term value of it unless more work is also done?

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll and then Commissioner MacMann.

MS. CARROLL: As a -- as a user of these trails, I would say that unimproved gravel hiking trails have a community use of their own for recreation, if not transportation. I would say that it is still more useful than the alternative, which is a sidewalk that goes nowhere, or no sidewalk at all, so I would look at that as more beneficial than what we would end up with. I -- my main problem is that there's -- I did not see any signage at that location of where the gravel trail started. I would like the City -- the Parks Department to put, like, just that small little green sign with the tiny placard. That's all that's needed. But that's not part of this request. I -- I assume that this does appear on the trail maps, so people who live there could know that it's there. People in the City at large could know that that's there to access. It has more value than a trail -- than a sidewalk that would go to a bridge that's never being built, and even if it was built, the chances of them tearing out the sidewalk that they put there sounds very high to me. I -- I don't see any advantage to having the sidewalk in the location where it would be required, and I do see an advantage to cutting out that extra, so, like, there's gravel or bush-shacked something that's covering that distance on the map that I assume the City or someone in the neighborhood is currently maintaining. Put a sidewalk there, and the City doesn't have to maintain gravel that has more upkeep associated with it.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Given -- I appreciate your concerns. I do.

MS. PLACIER: I don't want the sidewalk, by the way. I do not want the traditional

sidewalk. I'm just saying this is a super secret --

MR. MACMANN: I don't -- given a couple of things. I grew up in the country with deer runs and weed-whacked trails, although, when I was a kid, we didn't have weed-whackers, so you guys think about that for a minute. Even our discussion here, given the City Council will see this, given the 48 people who always watch and it always boggles my mind, and this trail does - already has some use. Someone has weed-whacked it, if nothing else, the deer are using it. It will become more utilized over time, and I think -- I think it's from an environmental use, also. This is going to follow the grade and go around and down. If we extend there the more sidewalk, it would be, like, a causeway into nowhere. Yeah. I think this trail will eventually get used. It's probably going to be low use. I appreciate that, and I appreciate Mr. Cox's concerns, but we can talk afterwards, Mr. Cox, about people in your neighborhood being problematic. We have the same problem. I think it will develop over time. That's what I think. I can't speak for Parks and Rec. They have their own funding stream. Apparently, no one can speak for Parks and Rec. I don't mean to be so flip about that, but I think it'll -- once the sidewalk is there, it will start to be used, particularly once the other one is connected. So I felt I needed to make a motion for it. All right.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Placier, I live across the street from a park where the trails are very rustic, and you wouldn't know they're there probably if you didn't live across the street from the park. They're maintained more by use than by Parks and Rec, but the more they're used, the more maintained they are by virtue of that fact. So I think creating more of an entrance or more access to this trail will actually, by virtue of that, improve the trails. Any additional discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

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

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

Motion # 1 - In the matter of Case 115-2022, design adjustments to Bluff Creek Estates Plat 10. move to waive the grading between the trail and future bridge abutment location. VOTING YES: Stanton, Burns, MacMann, Geuea Jones, Placier, Kimbell, Carroll, Wilson, Loe. VOTING NO: None. Motion carries 9-0.

Motion # 2 - In the matter of Case 115-2022, Bluff Creek Estates Plat No. 10, design adjustment, allow the sidewalk to be built in an alternative location as demonstrated by staff's report, move to approve. VOTING YES: Stanton, Burns, MacMann, Geuea Jones, Placier, Kimbell, Carroll, Wilson, Loe. VOTING NO: None. Motion carries 9-0.

Case # 156-2022

A request by Anderson Engineering (applicant), on behalf Sunshine Family Home Center LLC (owner), seeking approval of a major PD amendment. The intent is to allow the existing site to be used as a "Family day care center". The subject property is located northeast of the intersection of Holly Avenue and Andy Drive and is addressed 2207 Holly Avenue. **(This request was tabled at the May 19, 2022 Planning Commission meeting).**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Brad Kelley of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested Statement of Intent, PD Plan to be known as Sunshine Early Care and Education Center, and the associated design exception to Section 29-4.4(e) and Table 4-4.4.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Kelley. Before we move on to questions of staff, I would like to ask any Commissioner if they've had any ex parte related to this case to please share that with the Commission so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? We're well versed in this this go-around. Thank you, Mr. Kelley. With that, we'll open up the floor to public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If you can please give you name and address for the record.

MR. WOOTEN: Good evening. Tom Wooten with Anderson Engineering, 4240 Phillips Farm Road. I think Brad has covered everything from the last time we were here a few weeks ago, and I believe we have addressed all of the concerns from that meeting, and I believe we're in a good place. And I can answer any questions if you have any.

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

MR. WOOTEN: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers?

MS. TADZHIBAYEV: Ruzana Tadzhibayev, 20 - or sorry --1908 Southeast Trails Drive, and I'm also in agreeance with Tom Wooten and Brad Kelley, and I'm just here for questions.

MS. LOE: Any questions for this speaker. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a -- just a little follow-up. Just -- I'm going to ask you to say what you just said. We worked it all out. Right?

MS. TADZHIBAYEV: I believe so.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. And you're happy with how this is going to go and the commitments and all that stuff?

MS. TADZHIBAYEV: We have set plans in place for a fundraiser thing and things like that to make sure we meet everything within the next three years.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I think we're about to go in a good direction for you here.

MS. TADZHIBAYEV: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Not to belabor the point, but I know we raked you over the coals a couple of weeks ago. I think this is a really good result. You've done it the right way, and I think it will be of benefit to that neighborhood for a long time. So thank you.

MS. TADZHIBAYEV: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any additional speakers? If not, we will close public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission comments? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I think we have a question -

MS. LOE: Commissioner Burns, did you raise your hand?

MS. BURNS: I was going to make a motion, if Michael would let me.

MR. MACMANN: I was going to ask a question of staff, if this needed to be couched in a certain way, given where we had been before. Ms. Burns, please, by all means.

MS. BURNS: Thank you. In the matter of Case 156-2022, Sunshine Daycare, a major PD amendment, I recommend approval of the Statement of Intent, the PD plan, and the associated design exception.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

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

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

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

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

In the matter of Case 156-2022, Sunshine Daycare, a major PD amendment, recommend approval of the Statement of Intent, the PD plan, and the associated design exception.

Case # 165-2022

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of The Housing Authority of the City of Columbia (owners), for approval of a major PD amendment to the existing *PD Plan for Kinney Point* and the associated statement of intent located at the northeast corner of Garth Avenue and

Sexton Road and containing approximately 1.96-acres of land. The revised PD plan proposes 6, 4-plex buildings for a total of 24 units. The request also includes a design exception from the parking requirements of Section 29-4.3(b) of the UDC such that required on-site parking be reduced.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of requested PD Plan to be known as the *PD Plan for Kinney Point*, inclusive of the parking design exception, and subject to minor technical corrections prior to forwarding to City Council.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Before we move on to questions of staff, I would like to ask if there is any Commissioners who would wish to recuse themselves from this case? Commissioner Stanton and Commissioner MacMann? Duly noted. And again, before questions, I would like to ask any Commissioners who have had any ex parte related to this case to please share that with the Commission at this time so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: If I remember right, when this was discussed before, there was some stormwater concern. I see that there are two stormwater management locations on this plan. I know it's early in the process. Has anyone done a stormwater management survey yet?

MR. PALMER: The -- Mr. Crockett could probably elaborate on that, but typically, there's some preliminary study done and at least -- in at least locating where those would go. Obviously, a fairly quick look at topography map will tell you the logical places for stormwater to go. But the Code does require that it be mitigated on site, and so we don't anticipate there being any additional issues from, you know, what's -- what exists there now, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: If I remember right, the last time there was some discussion about right now it turns into a swamp during heavy rains.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Hopefully, the site improvement would -- would fix that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none. We'll open up the floor to public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: And please give your name and address for the record.

MR. CROCKETT: Members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I promise to be the last time tonight. With me tonight is Randy Cole, Executive Director of the Columbia Housing Authority. Again, we're looking at 1.96

acres, just under two acres, of PD zoned property. You are probably tired of seeing this property. It's been before this Commission many times in the past, but as we move forward, we want to change the product that's being presented. And so again, we're asking for a new SOI, a new PD plan, and I think this plan is better than the previous plan. It's more conducive to the neighbors, and it's had a lot more neighborhood input while keeping the density the same. You've seen this plan before. This is what we're proposing. This is the previous plan. You can see the difference. This one basically gets the units on there, it works, and it fits the site, but we believe that this one is going to be better for the residents themselves, as well as the neighbors adjacent to the property in this part of the City. I don't want us to dwell on this picture too much. This is just an idea that we have. And, again, I believe the Housing Authority and Mr. Cole is working with the residents to come up and formulate what the exact buildings are going to look like long term. I just want to kind of show something here. This is just kind of a rendering that I picked that kind of illustrates the thought and the ideas that we just don't want just a cookie cutter blank multi-family building. We want something that has front porches. And that's part of the reason why we asked for the request for the front porch setback. To go into the setback just a little bit, it's according to Code, but because we want the front porches on these buildings, and we want to kind of break them up. We don't want just a monotonous straightforward cookie cutter same building all the way down the street. We are asking for a parking -- a design adjustment for the parking requirement. That's twofold. First of all, we don't believe the residents in this community, in this development, need to have or are they going to need that many parking spaces. The number of vehicles that they have, we're probably going to have more single-parent, you know, members or residents here, individuals that don't have vehicles, that simply don't drive. We don't need the parking -- the number of parking spaces that's required by Code. And so we're asking for that design adjustment for that reason. Secondly, the neighbors have asked for more open space. They've asked us to look at the trees and try to preserve some of those big, large trees that are onsite. If you've been by the site, it's got a lot of beautiful trees on it. I mean, great, large trees, and so we're doing the best we can to serve -- to preserve as many of those trees as we can. And so in doing so, we want to reduce that parking number. Now, the good thing about that is, and I think -- you know, I think that Mr. Palmer kind of alluded to this, is if we needed some additional parking in the future, we have spaces that we can add additional parking spaces. So while we're asking for the design adjustment now, it can be added later in the future. We would have to come back through this Commission again to do that, but it's not that if you grant that variance now, and then we -- of course, we need more spaces, you know,

we do have a mechanism for that and a place to put them. So that's kind of what we're looking for. Again, we're only two blocks away from public transit, which, of course, is important. So I think it's a fairly straightforward request. I think it's a better plan than what's been presented before in the past. I think this, you know, has a lot of better -- a lot more benefits. We are planning for a mix of two-, three- and four-bedroom units, and, of course, there has been quite a bit of conversation between Mr. Cole and the residents to try and formulate a plan that works for them, as well. We want to be, you know, mindful of their needs and their concerns for this project. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: I know you had mentioned something -- okay. So you have 22 less parking spaces than what's required. I know the staff had mentioned some extra parking on Sexton Road; is that correct?

MR. CROCKETT: No. They just said that parking is allowed on Sexton Road. We don't anticipate utilizing any off-site parking spaces. They're just saying that Garth has prohibited parking and parking is allowed on Sexton. So if we -- if, for some reason, we had to have a very short-term overflow parking, folks could park on Sexton. We don't want to have folks parking on Sexton. The Housing Authority owns the property further to -- to the south, Oak Towers, that they could have adequate parking that they could park over there, as well, but we certainly don't want any type of regular occurring parking on Sexton Road. We want them all within the parking lot itself.

MS. KIMBELL: So if -- if that -- just run with me here. If you had to, how would you go about compensating the additional 22 parking spaces, other than --

MR. CROCKETT: It may not be 22 additional parking spaces, but the driveway that's on the west side coming in, the entire north side is -- is the location where we could add a substantial number of parking spaces. And again, we'd rather not do that. One of the - - one of the concerns that the neighbors had from this previous plan is you can see that that entire row of parking that backs up to the residences to the north.

MS. KIMBELL: Yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: We wanted to get away from that. And so, we tried to pull that down. We tried to buffer it with a single-story building. We put a driveway in that has ample space between it and the property line, and we do have some parking spaces in there, but the setbacks are much greater than -- than the previous plan. And so while we can add additional spaces, maybe not 22, but we can add additional spaces to the site.

MS. KIMBELL: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Two questions. I'm going to start with -- refresh my memory. The church wants the connection to their existing parking lot; is that right?

MR. CROCKETT: They have -- yeah. They have talks -- Mr. Cole has talked to them about that connection. If you look at it right now, the -- the connection comes out -- obviously, the driveway comes out and it comes across this property. That was all done when it was all one property, and then it was subdivided into two -- into two separate parcels, but that driveway connection still exists. And so for us to be able to develop it, you can see that they have angle parking in their development; and therefore, they would need to utilize our piece of property to access their parking lot.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: So we want to be, you know, friendly neighbors and have cross-access.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I thought that was right, but it had been a minute. And then stormwater, I know you're going to have to do all the due diligence and all of that, but it is a problem on this property?

MR. CROCKETT: It is a problem. And to go into it in a little bit more detail, and maybe you don't really care too much, but I'll explain it anyway. This site qualifies as a redevelopment site, so, therefore, are normally our stormwater requirements would be less according to the Code. However, given the downstream -- I don't want to say flooding concerns, but stormwater concerns, downstream stormwater concerns, this site is not eligible for the reduction that we get for redevelopment. Therefore, we have to treat this as a brand-new site, as -- you know, as a green field site. So what we're doing is, as you indicated, we have two basins. We've preliminarily sized to those two basins to handle most of this site. The other basin that's between us and the -- the neighbor to the east, there's an existing basin there now. That existing basin serves their property. We're going to expand that slightly to pick up that additional stormwater that we need for our site.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are you thinking, like, rain garden type basins, or are you thinking just cement block --

MR. CROCKETT: No, we're not -- no. I mean, we like to do earthen basins, earthen berms that are very low-keyed, very, you know, neighbor friendly. You know, the last thing I want is to get a small child in there and they get stuck in a trash rack or something like that. So we do have to have to have own enclosed structures, but I don't want concrete basins with big walls. I want to have earthen basins as much as possible.

And, you know, I mean, they're -- they're small, but they can be areas of open spaces that kids can use, you know, when they're dry. So we can mow them and maintain them. We don't want to have concrete basins.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Additional questions for this speaker? Mr. Crockett, typically, when we get a request or when we look at reducing parking, we often see bicycle spots added. And the last plan that came through actually did have spots for bicycles. Is there a reason that's not included?

MR. CROCKETT: We will -- we will have bicycle spaces. and, Ms. Loe, I believe I -- I was thinking today, they're actually --

MR. COLE: They're inside the buildings.

MR. CROCKETT: They put them inside the buildings. I'm sorry. So I was thinking -- I was -- I was thinking we added them there, but those were the mail kiosks. But the bicycle spaces are included inside the -- inside the units, inside the buildings.

MS. LOE: I was wondering if that -- if the intent was to put them in the patio areas, or -- all right. And I guess I'm still thinking kids' bikes or --

MS. CARROLL: So do you have an area inside the individual units for bikes, or you have bike locks, community bike locks in the front of the buildings?

MS. LOE: Mr. Cole, we need you to state your name and address before you --

MR. COLE: My name is Randy Cole, CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority, 201 Switzler. So in working with our architect on some of our preliminary plans, a big need we've seen with our residents is additional storage space, especially for outdoor materials like barbecues, bikes, things like that. Some of the kids' bikes have walked off of their property, so within these units, we're going to include some exterior storage space that maybe isn't in the thermal envelope, but like a closet they could open. Not a full-on garage, but just a little area where they could put a bike, a barbecue, some stuff like that.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any additional questions?

MS. CARROLL: What about --

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: What about bike spots for visitors, for people going to and from as transportation. So part of the -- part of the rationale for bike spots in place of parking spots is for use of bikes as transportation, and -- and visitors, yeah. So I do notice a lot of bicycle transportation among people using our HA housing.

MR. CROCKETT: I believe -- I believe there's spaces -- certainly spaces on this plan that we could add -- add some exterior bike spaces.

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

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

Additional speakers on this case?

MR. COLE: All right. Randy Cole, CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority. I had a few slides I wanted to go over.

MS. LOE: Can we get your address again, Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: Oh, yeah. 201 Switzler. Thank you. Appreciate being here. So a little additional background about the project and why it's important for our community. We did go through a funding process with the Housing and Community Development Commission for HOME ARP Funds, so these were some of the special home dollars for affordable housing through the American Recovery Plan Act, different from the ARPA funding that you're hearing about in the news. This was a special allocation just for affordable housing. But the Housing Community Development Commission recommended unanimously and then so did the City Council, \$2 million in HOME ARP funds for the project. I think there's a lot of excitement for the project. The Veterans United Foundation has also contributed \$1.3 million to the Columbia Housing Authority for this project. And given that high level of local support, we've now qualified for the non-competitive federal tax credit -- rolling tax credit, the 4 percent credit through the Missouri Housing and Development Commission, so we'll leverage another \$2.7 million, and then we have \$1 million of our own resources going towards the project. So it's a great project with a lot of -- lot of community support. We worked in partnership, I would say, with the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association. My work at the City here with the Columbia Community Land Trust, I had a lot of good partnership with Ridgeway, and they've been a great partner as I've transitioned over to the Columbia Housing Authority. I felt it to be very important to engage the neighborhood. I know there was some dissatisfaction with previous plans, and I wanted to create a plan that everyone was on board with and -- and proud about, so I wheeled my barbecue grill out, cooked everybody burgers and hot dogs and asked them what they wanted to see here, so what you see is a rendition of all of the input from the neighborhood on what they wanted. They wanted larger -- or multi-family buildings that looked like the older, larger homes that used to front Sexton, so that's what we came up with, the four-plexes that modeled that to go with what the neighborhood wanted there. And, again, they wanted a single story in the back, and they wanted actually less parking spaces so we could save more trees, and that kind of worked well with the level of -- of vehicle needs we've seen on other residences. I really think this project will be a catalyst for addressing -- starting to address our community's homeless and housing and security needs. It's a big deal in our community, and we need to get moving on getting more affordable housing in our community. And I think this

will be a project that will be a catalyst to do that. We think it'll impact 357 homeless and housing insecure individuals in the next 20 years, and those are the populations that we'll serve. And it will also be a kick start to us renovating the remaining 120 units we have downtown here that need -- desperately need renovating, as well. But as we renovate those, we need good, nice affordable housing to move people to on a rolling basis, so this will give us additional capacity to start that process. And looking at the needs of our community, you know, we have 238 homeless individuals on our point in time counting from 2020. There's 240 homeless CPS children that are identified by our home-school communicators, 70 of which are living in hotels up on the Business Loop right now tonight that would be eligible for this housing, and we have about 1,200 households on our wait list. Our market city identified 1,400 eligible households in terms of the income limits and who would qualify for this type of affordable housing, and that's that many eligible households within our four central city census tracts, 7, 21, 9, and 2, so the need is there. Again, so I reiterate Ridgeway was a great partner on this project. Some of the feedback we got, we did one meeting where we went with a blank slate and asked what they wanted to see, and then we came back with some preliminary drawings, and this was some of the feedback that we collected. I have the actual handwritten notes if you want to verify that. But the one that I think I'm most proud of is it says it seems like the design has considered a lot of public requests and comments voiced at the meeting. One last comment with the stormwater. I would say the stormwater is in much better shape in that neighborhood than it was in 2018. We had that big stormwater improvement as a part of my last job on Sexton when we built the -- or the Lynn Street Cottages. We did a large stormwater improvement there that was in much bigger capacity than what was needed on the eight -- seven to eight homes there, and again the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association and Pat Kelly were very helpful on that part. So I stood in rainstorms before we did that improvement, and then afterwards, so that -- that intersection has been a problem for many, many years, but it is very different than it was in 2018, so I encourage you go -- go down there in a rainstorm now and it's a little bit better, but there's more -- more work to be done, and we definitely want to consider stormwater on our -- our next project here. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Cole. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Mr. Cole, what's your time line on this project?

MR. COLE: So we're having to submit our tax credit application either tomorrow or Monday, so that will be good. And then we have to wait for MHDC to get back with us on approval. We'll be in the noncompetitive round, but they have to go through a process of

verifying our underwriting, our other sources of funds. So thinking of all the financing coming into play, I think we would close on the financing either close to the end of this year or early next, depending on, you know, this HUD's process with the City, and then MHDC's process, and us getting started, so I think spring of next year would be very reasonable. I think we could be starting to lease up people before the end of next year.

MS. BURNS: Great. Thank you.

MS. COLE: Okay.

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

MS. JESSE: My name is Connie Jesse; I live at 16 East Sexton Road, and I've lived there for 38 years, almost 39. And your sewer questions, yes. When we first bought our house, when it rained, people put boats at Garth and Sexton Road, and you could go for, like, quite a ways. It has improved, but there is still a little bit of concern, especially with this project. I think there will be some strain, so I hope those are looked at. In regards to the parking, I don't think Oak Towers is a good reference because this is -- this housing is different. Oak Towers is senior housing, and so they have OATS and SIL and those kind of things, so they don't have cars, true, but this project, I think, will have more cars than what people are anticipating. In regards to parking on Sexton Road, God, I hope that does not happen because it happens now when Ridgeway has events at Ridgeway School, and it's horrible. And parking on Sexton Road, I would not recommend that. It's -- it's not -- I don't think a good idea to recommend parking on the street on Sexton Road. So that's all I have to say. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Living in that area, do you see the parking lot at Oak Towers, does it tend to be full or does there tend to be available spaces there -- overflow?

MS. JESSE: There's normally available spaces, but like I said, that's senior housing. And so there are a lot of people that don't have cars that live in Oak Towers, and they depend on public transportation, like SIL and OATS buses and that kind of thing.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

MS. JESSE: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: Additional questions? I see none. Thank you.

MS. JESSE: Uh-huh.

MS. KELLY: My name is Pat Kelly; I live at 1007 Grand Avenue, and I'm the acting president for the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association. Last fall, we started -- well, over the years, we have met with a number of developers who wanted to develop this area, and last fall, we started meeting with Columbia Housing Authority. And right from the first, we wanted some things like to keep the neighborhood -- the street walkable, you know. And

so not having a big parking lot next to the street, have -- not have, like, a great big building, but have something more on the scale of the houses around. And Columbia Housing Authority really did, I think, a great job of meeting those requests with -- you know, with spending a lot of time getting the pitch of the roof just right to match and -- and doing the Arts and Crafts columns, and adding the porches to keep that, so that was really a -- I -- you know, I really appreciated that, and many of the neighbors did. And something even for people who were not interested in the design or anything else, they were interested in saving those trees. Over the years, we've lost a lot of our tree canopy in the neighborhood, and those have magnificent trees. And so kind of the deal killer for a lot of people was reducing the parking. And so they were very happy to find -- to reduce the spaces from, you know, 65 lots to 40. And I spent some time this winter just counting the parking spaces over at Oak Towers that I checked on weekends and weekdays and evenings, and there were usually about -- average around 45 cars in parking lots, and there are, I believe, 179 units in Oak Towers, so I'm thinking that maybe a quarter of the people at Oak Towers are regularly driving cars. So I really do think that having two -- basically, the plan before was two and a half cars per unit, which, I think, would have way too many, and we would have had to lose those trees that have meant so much to adding the beauty and the character of the neighborhood. So I think that that -- the parking reduction is really great. And there's also -- there were a lot of concerns in the neighborhood, but we also acknowledge that there was a desperate need for housing. There are people who have been sleeping across the street from where I live. If you go down Wilkes, there are people sleeping out on the pavement. The need for housing is desperate. And I think that this sets a very good model for how we can develop affordable housing and also work with the neighborhood to add a housing that is consistent with neighborhood architectural patterns and values. And so I'm here tonight to support this project, and all the effort and all the willingness to work us that has gone into this.

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

MS. JEFFERSON: Barbara Jefferson, 305 North Fifth Street. I am on that Housing and Board Commission, Community Development Board, and I did vote yes for this only because of Pat Kelly; okay? I hope it goes well. I foresee many problems that could go wrong with it. It's your all's decision.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none.

MS. CARROLL: I wonder what --

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Thanks. I wonder if we could ask Barbara Jefferson a question.

MS. LOE: Ms. Jefferson, do you want to come back up to the podium.

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. I wondered what your concerns were. You said you --

MS. JEFFERSON: Traffic congestion. And just because they say they don't foresee people parking on that Garth -- on Sexton, I'm just thinking how terrible it would be if it actually happens. Yes. Oak Towers is supposed to be a senior -- a place for a senior center -- a place for seniors. However, you know, it just bothers me that the thought of having that many people, because I'm -- the way I add it up, it could be up to 72 residents. I could be wrong. If there are 24 units, you maybe have two to three bedrooms or something like that. So I just see it as -- it's a congestion problem in multiple different ways -- traffic, the number of people. You're across from a senior -- what's supposed to be a senior -- senior center. I hope it goes well.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

MS. LOE: If there's no additional speakers, we are -- close public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commissioner comment? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: I just wondered about the comments that Barbara Jefferson just made and if I could ask Mr. Cole something?

MS. LOE: We can open up public hearing again.

MS. PLACIER: Well, and just in terms of what are the provisions for public housing for -- well, I don't want to call it rules, but, you know, what are the stipulations that you make on public housing -- residents and their impacts on -- on the neighborhood, on Oak Towers, in particular.

MS. LOE: If -- open up public hearing, again.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: And we need your name and address again, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: My name is Randy Cole, CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority, 201 Switzler. So I think we were talking about parking, the 1.66 spaces, I can talk about that. When we were -- when we were thinking about how many spaces we need, we weren't necessarily looking at Oak Towers, even though that lot is, you know, less than 50 percent most of the time, but we looked at all of our family sites around our admin building, and what -- and what's the average car per -- per space there. And then, you know, what we think would be reasonable for visitors, that's how we landed on that number. In terms of provisions or rules for residents, you know, they have a lease that they abide by just like any -- any property manager would do. And then we also provide supportive services to help them connect other services in their community. We have a maintenance staff on staff that is on call 24/7 that does a great job. And we're just here

to serve our residents. I'm really excited about the Columbia Housing Authority.

MS. LOE: So if I can follow up on Commissioner Placier's questions, the number -- or how many cars per unit do you -- did you come up with for the family units?

MR. COLE: Usually one. Sometimes there's two. So it kind of varies, you know. It depends. We do have single mothers with kids, and then we have some people that have two cars or it might be a single mother that has a visitor every once in a while. But I think -- I think where we landed is a pretty reasonable number. I think 60 --

MS. LOE: And the bedroom count on those units is comparable to what would be going in at this site?

MR. COLE: Yeah. It's comparable to our family sites, yeah.

MS. LOE: So you're saying one to two cars per unit on your other family units, so an average of 1.5 cars?

MR. COLE: Uh-huh. Yeah.

MS. LOE: Which is where you're coming up with the 1.66, because that allows a little -- a little fudge for visitor parking?

MR. COLE: Correct.

MS. LOE: How many cars can you add on the north side of the driveway -- the west driveway?

MR. COLE: That would be a question for Tim.

MS. LOE: Because I have to admit, building in some cushion for future parking, as someone whose day job is also in subsidized housing, I've added parking because our earlier standards was one car per one bedroom, or half -- half a car per one bedroom for the senior, and that wasn't enough. And we had to go back -- that was back in the '70s, because they didn't think they would have cars. And that -- granted it's in more rural areas, but --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. LOE: -- it's nice when you have room on the site to add parking. You're going to have to come up, introduce yourself, and speak into the microphone, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Tim Crockett, 1000 West Nifong. To answer your question, we can add about another ten spaces, so that would potentially put us over the 50, which would give us over a two -- two parking space per unit ratio if we were to add those ten spaces.

MS. LOE: Does that leave the tree?

MR. CROCKETT: No.

MS. LOE: No.

MR. CROCKETT: The tree would have to come down.

MS. LOE: The tree would have to come down.

MR. CROCKETT: Correct. That's part of the reason why we wanted to save that tree and save that area.

MS. LOE: All right. Appreciate it. I think we have more questions for you.

Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: This is probably Randy's department.

MR. COLE: Do you need my address again?

MS. LOE: I think they know who is -- who is speaking for the record, I'm afraid, so, yes.

MR. COLE: Okay. Randy Cole, CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority, 201 Switzler.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. So are you planning -- we've been talking about Oak Towers as a place for overflow if it's needed. Will you update the signage to -- to make it clear that if you live at Kinney Point, you can park at Oak Towers?

MR. COLE: We can most certainly do that, yeah. I would be happy -- we would be happy to do that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think that would alleviate some of this, because then it's very clear, hey, if I get home, and every spot is full, I know I can go across the street.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah. We really want to try to think outside the box to meet the neighborhood's needs of wanting to save those trees. That seems like a very good solution.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And I think we may be getting to a place where, societally, we have fewer cars.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. I'm in favor of saving the trees, too. What would trigger -- or how would you evaluate if you needed to go ahead and remove the tree and add the additional ten spaces? Will you do an evaluation in three months, in six months? How --

MR. COLE: It would be -- it would call from our residents.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Our residents are very responsive to us and we're very in tune with them, and we want to serve them, so I think we'd get feedback pretty quickly.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Is there any concern of liability with individuals maybe with children or elderly people parking across the street and having to walk across the street?

MR. COLE: Yeah. There is a crosswalk there, so, yeah. It is -- it is a fairly busy

road, so that -- you know, that's something to consider. You know, it might be such that people that live there would have their spaces, visitors across the street, but certainly they might have some visitors with -- with young and old. But I think that intersection has been improved recently with lines, and -- but you would have an extra street to cross.

MS. WILSON: I do have another question. In terms of having to remove the trees, which I think everyone does not want, what is it, I'm The Lorax, I speak for the trees. So I'm -- I'm assuming that the litmus test would be Oak Towers parking lot is full, so now we're thinking about having to add more space over there by -- and remove the trees. So that seems to me to be that you would really want to use Oak Towers first, and then that considered --

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. WILSON: So -- so the possibility is very low?

MR. COLE: Yeah. I don't -- I don't know that I would see Oak Towers getting all the way full. I -- I'm over there quite a bit at different times of the day, different days, sometimes on the weekends --

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

MR. COLE: -- and I just -- I don't see it getting -- yeah.

MS. WILSON: I'm just trying to understand how we ever get to removing the trees. It doesn't seem like it would ever happen.

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: If I may, Mr. Cole, how many units are at Oak Tower, and what is their bedroom mix?

MR. COLE: A hundred and seventy-five, and they're all studio or one bedroom. There are two people in some units. Most of the units, it's a single person.

MR. ZENNER: That would be on -- if they're one bedroom, if I'm not incorrect, that would be one and a half spaces per bedroom or per unit. If I recall, one or one and a half. I can't remember. Even if it's at one, that's 175 required parking spaces. You said 175 units; is that correct?

MR. COLE: Yeah. I don't know. I haven't counted the parking spaces at Oak Tower. I'm not -- I'm not sure are over there.

MR. ZENNER: And the only reason I raise that question is is before we get enamored by the idea of utilizing parking across the street to meet the 22, we have to evaluate and have an understanding of what the required parking demand is of Oak Tower, what's actually being used. Again, there's a disconnect between the use, the actual day-to-day use, and what our Code requires. And so when we -- when we come to that

point, there may need to be some additional consideration given as it relates to the two properties. The Code is very clear that because these properties are within a proximity of each other, shared parking could potentially exist, but we have to understand the basis of parking requirements for both. And so the request that is being made has -- has been the standard established when most people do come forward to this body asking for an exception of this nature is do you have data to support your reduction. And as Mr. Cole has pointed out, their surveying data historically has shown that their sites are under -- their bedroom mixture is not anywhere comparable to what our Code requires. And so from a pure perspective, from a pure administrative perspective, the requested waiver without any additives to it, but understanding that there are options that can be creatively utilized administratively is what would be most advised when you take your action. No additions. Vote on what the housing has asked for. We can work out administratively, most likely, within the context of the Code as we are allowed, how we make the changes work should the clientele or complaints come in, and that is something that we can deal with in order to ensure that we're having the beneficial conversation that needs to be had at the time necessary. Thank you, Mr. Cole.

MR. COLE: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Any additional questions for Mr. Cole? I see none. Thank you. With that, we will close public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission comments? Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: So, Mr. Zenner, are you recommending that we change maybe what the motion would be to add language?

MR. ZENNER: No. If that was where you were heading, I would advise you not to.

MS. BURNS: Okay. Okay.

MR. ZENNER: The plan -- the plan, as it is submitted.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: So Mr. Palmer's recommendation is with technical corrections. You will note, as you probably read the staff report, at the time the staff report was prepared, we did not have the actual bedroom mix; and therefore, there was a significant lack of clarity on what the actual total required parking would be. What was shown on the plan was 48 spaces based on single family, two per unit, and then an additional six overflow parking spaces which was based on one per four -- one per six units -- I'm sorry. The other way around, one -- six extra spaces for guest parking, which is a multi-family standard. So as the staff report pointed out, there was a muddling of our parking requirements. Part of the revisions that will need to be shown on this plan are actually

what the standard requirement would be, which is the 62, based on the bedroom mix and what the authorized design exception will be, which would be a minimum of 40. As Mr. Crockett has pointed out, as Mr. Cole has conferred and stated is possible, ten additional parking spaces could be added in on site if needed. However, we don't want to lose the trees. Therefore, we would probably be coordinating to work out some solution, but we want to make clear that the minimum amount of parking spaces is what is shown on the plan. No need for a separate motion on that because it is a design exception, it is not a design adjustment. There was some confusion when this application was initially submitted. Design exceptions are permitted within the PD, and because parking is considered part of the zoning side of it, not the subdivision, there is only a design exception required, not a design adjustment.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Are you going to make the motion now?

MS. BURNS: I'd be happy to unless someone else -- come on. Somebody else jump in here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm happy to.

MS. BURNS: Go ahead, Sharon.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Seeing no other comments, I have a motion. I move in the case of -- Case Number 165-2022, PD plan for Kinney Point major amendment, that we do approve the plan with the proposed Statement of Intent and the design exception for reduced parking subject to minor technical corrections.

MS. KIMBELL: Second.

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

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 7-0 with two abstentions.

MS. CARROLL: We have seven votes to approve and two abstentions.

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

In the matter of Case Number 165-2022, PD plan for Kinney Point major amendment, move to approve the plan with the proposed Statement of Intent and the design exception for reduced parking subject to minor technical corrections.

Yes: 7 - Burns, Loe, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Kimbell, Placier and Wilson

Abstain: 2 - Stanton and MacMann

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Any additional public comments? Seeing none.

VIII. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. ZENNER: Least we scare Ms. Wilson away, this is the comedy hour after the end of the meeting. So your next meeting will be June 23rd. You will not have this smiling mug looking at you that evening. I will be out of town, so Mr. Smith will be in the co-pilot seat guiding you all. He is also your principal skewer at the work session, so you can have him flail on the ground as he proposes text changes for you to consider. We are working on the next round, and there should be some interesting conversation from what I've been told. You will have a slightly smaller agenda. That doesn't necessarily always mean that it will be less enjoyable, but it should be. It should be a shorter agenda. You have a single subdivision action, and this is for CMSC Giving Gardens. It's the final plat. If you recall correctly, several months ago, we annexed in the front parcel, the former water tank site for -- if I recall correctly, it was the water district or may it have been -- yeah. It was the water district's property. It is not a legal lot; therefore, it does need to be platted. It is being proposed to be platted in with the existing CMC Gardens IG parcel, so it will be a split-zoned tract of land. We annexed in the front M-OF. The back was their existing operations and their -- the warehousing space and all of their operational areas. It is zoned IG and has been zoned IG for years. There was great discussion regarding the combination of the two parcels and the split zoning. However, as will be explained by Mr. Kelley, as well as Crockett Engineering's office, who is the engineer of record, part of it goes to a lot of how that front parcel is being proposed to be developed in relationship to the back building, and because of that, it was going to be easier to merge the two parcels into a single tract of land currently served by sewer thereby allowing a connection of an additional lateral off of the existing sewer line that runs to the property for development of the front site for an expanded adult daycare facility that they would like to put on the property, as well as an office expansion for their general operations offices. All of that can be accommodated within both zoning districts, so pursuant to our Code, a split-zone parcel in this particular instance, while not generally desired, is not considered a horrible situation to have. If ever there was anything to occur on the front parcel that would be industrial in nature, it would have to come back for a rezoning or reverse. If anything on the back of the parcel wanted to go office, it would have to come in for an office designation zoning, so we can correct any land-use changes later, but this is in order to accommodate their immediate desire for

some construction activity on the front parcel that has to be a legal lot first. So no zoning discussed with this during the platting hearing. It's simply a plat and it's a pretty straightforward one at that, if I understand correctly. The last two cases you'll have on your agenda is your tabled item from this evening, and that is 102 Somerset Village, Plat 1, the PD plan. That is just to the northeast of the intersection of Battle and St. Charles Road. And then our previously tabled project off of St. Charles Road up by the Sonic and the commercial development at the -- in between the two roundabouts for the Dollar General. Mr. Palmer will be here to take the shellacking on that, and Mr. Kelley can be your boy for the other two. And Mr. Smith will just be, you know, color commentary like me later. We are looking at an even lighter agenda for your first meeting in July. There is only, at this point, a single item on that agenda, and it does appear to be staying on track. It is a relatively straightforward request. So we are seeing a little bit of slowdown, so the summer is a good time if you want to take a little bit of time off, not all of you at the same time, please, we're seeing a little bit of a slowdown. I anticipate with some of the development that we have had approved here, though, over the course of this earlier portion of this year, we will have some fairly substantial volumes coming in later. We do have a number of projects that are out in concept review land that have already come through and we're just waiting for the timing to be proper. Some major subdivision activity is also on the horizon right now, as well. Not as major as what we saw at Sinclair Farms, but significant. So you guys will have your hands full with some interesting development proposals coming up. And then, obviously, we will have text change amendments that will be introduced sparingly as we go through the next several months in order to keep our amendment cycle running. With that, as I said this evening in work session, we will provide you short-term rental information that we have been working on at this point. You all have a copy of the PowerPoint presentation that Ms. Smith made this evening, so you have that already. And then we will be looking forward to receiving your comments as to other use-specific standards that you would like me to begin to review and incorporate into the broader STR ordinance itself for us to consider more holistically. I look forward to having the opportunity to come back to you all at the beginning of July, and I wish you a good night. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

MR. ZENNER: And here are your parcels if you didn't know where they were already.

IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. LOE: I would like to welcome our newest Commissioner, Commissioner Wilson. Warm welcome. Thank you for joining us. We have fun. I mean, it will feel like fun after a while. Trust us. Welcome.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE - June 23, 2022 @ 7 pm (tentative)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MS. LOE: With that, we're adjourned. Oh, I need a --

MS. BURNS: I move to adjourn.

MS. LOE: Moved --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Second.

MS. LOE: Seconded - moved by Commissioner Burns. Seconded by Commissioner

Geuea Jones.

(Off the record.)

(The meeting was adjourned at 10:23 p.m.)

Move to adjourn