

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
MAY 4,2023

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Ms. Sharon Geuea Jones
Ms. Valerie Carroll
Ms. Tootie Burns
Ms. Sara Loe
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Mr. Michael MacMann
Ms. Peggy Placier
Ms. Shannon Wilson

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Ms. Robbin Kimbell

STAFF

Mr. Pat Zenner
Ms. Rebecca Thompson
Mr. Rusty Palmer
Mr. Brad Kelley
Mr. Tim Teddy

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. GEUEA JONES: I will now call this session of the City of Columbia Planning and Zoning Commission to order, Thursday, May 4, 2023.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton? I'll go back around. Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Present.

MS. CARROLL: I am here. Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton is --

MS. GEUEA JONES: We have a quorum without him. Right?

MS. CARROLL: -- absent for the moment.

MS. BURNS: There he is right -- he's coming right now.

MS. GEUEA JONES: There he is. For the record, Commissioner Stanton is in the room and approaching the dais.

MR. STANTON: Here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We have a quorum?

MS. CARROLL: We have a quorum.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, Commissioner Carroll.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, are there any changes to our agenda tonight?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval of the agenda is moved by Commissioner MacMann and seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Can I get a thumbs-up approval of the agenda. Unanimous.
(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MS. GEUEA JONES: We all received a copy of the April 20th, 2023 regular meeting minutes. Are there any changes to said minutes?

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval is moved by Commissioner MacMann; seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Thumbs-up approval of the minutes? Unanimous.
(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much.

V. TABLING REQUESTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Our first item tonight is a tabling request.

Case Number 143-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering Company (Agent) on behalf of Nodhead Investments, LLC (owner) for approval of a PD plan amendment to the Village of Cherry Hill PD Plan to facilitate development on existing lots 1C and 1D, to be known as The Village of Cherry Hill CP Plan. The

approximately 0.41-acre subject site is located mid-block on Jubilee Street between Cherry Hill Drive and Corona Road, and includes the address 2000 Corona Road. (A request to table this item to the June 8, 2023 Commission meeting has been received.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

MR. ZENNER: This particular item has run into a snag as it relates to some regulatory comments that we are awaiting responses on. And, as such, the applicant has asked for this extended tabling. This is not just a single meeting. This is to the June 8th, which will be our first meeting in the month of June. Again, this is a request basically for a PD plan amendment. Not all of the information on the slide got updated, so it does include a corresponding plat that goes along with it, as well, for the consolidation of the two lots that are shown under that cross-hatched area. Staff is supportive of the request to table to June 8th, and we will be more than happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Was there public notice?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, there was. This was a public hearing item.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for staff regarding the tabling request? Seeing none. Oh, sorry. Commissioner MacMann, did you have a question.

MR. MACMANN: No.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Seeing none. Is there any member of the public who is here to speak on this case tonight? We will not be addressing the merits of this case tonight, merely the tabling to a date certain.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Seeing no movement. Excellent.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any Commission comment on the tabling request?
Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If there are no questions or concerns by my fellow Commissioners, I have a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please.

MR. MACMANN: In the matter of Case 143-2023, 2000 Corona PD Plan revision, I move to table to date certain, 8 June 2023.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion to approve has been moved by Commissioner MacMann; seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: We have eight votes. The motion is carried.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That case will be tabled to June 8, 2023.

VI. SUBDIVISIONS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next up, we have Subdivisions.

Case Number 123-2023

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Green Meadows Property, LLC (owner), for approval of a four-lot Preliminary Plat of R-1 (One-family Dwelling) zoned property, to be known as *Quail Creek West Plat 8*. The approximately 18.42-acre subject site is located southwest of Smith Drive and Louisville Drive and includes the address 825 Louisville Drive.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Brad Kelley of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the Quail Creek West Plat 8 preliminary plat.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for the staff, if any member of the Commission has had outside communication with parties to this case number, please let us know now so that we all have the same information to work from. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Real quickly, again, Planner Kelley. The building envelopes and sinkhole locations will travel in perpetuity with the deeds on these properties?

MR. KELLEY: We intend to show them on the final plat. I couldn't speak as to what the deed will say, but it would be on the plat itself.

MR. MACMANN: All right. My -- my concern is as follows. Many times when you buy a house, you get the deed with the red description, and I want to build a garage later on or something like that, how are they going to know?

MR. KELLEY: I think our attempt at getting to that point is showing it on the plats that we're doing. That way whenever they propose a plot plan and permitting staff see the building permit come in for it, they will immediately look at the plat and see this on here -- or see what's not for development or where the buildable areas are, and then flag it there and inform them at that time.

MR. MACMANN: Fingers crossed, Mr. Kelley. Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I think you may have gotten at my question. I'm wondering if there are required disclosures when the property is for sale, which is slightly different than marked on the deed. I don't know if legal would know that information.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Gebhardt may be able to answer that question. That is outside the purview of the City.

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. Okay. The other question I had was the placement of the driveways. I think I see it marked on the plat here. Is that the -- yeah. Right above where the -- the sewer line goes

in and not in the buildable area. Are we concerned about driveways given that driveways are a structure and they may have cars and/or garages associated with them?

MR. KELLEY: For the driveway itself, I think this is okay. What the building area is pointing out is most of the structure with a foundation like you're talking about, it does allow for other things in the areas that aren't the sink areas. For example, the utility easements and other things. If I went back to the sink area exhibit, you would see that the driveways -- I guess we can go into it. The -- let's see. The driveways and the sewer avoid the sink areas.

MS. CARROLL: Right. It looks like it's right above the boring mark B15, so it's not in the center of a sink area, but it is in an area that's not designated as a buildable area --

MR. KELLEY: Correct. Yeah. Again, the possible --

MS. CARROLL: -- the structure that it adds to runoff. Okay. Well, I think I have the answer.

Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Okay. Seeing none. I will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward, state your name and address for the record. Six minutes for groups, three minutes for an individual. And, yes, please adjustment the mic as you are very tall, sir.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you. My name is Jay Gebhardt; I'm a civil engineer and land surveyor with A Civil Group, and I'm here tonight with Nate and Kathy Reuter. To answer your questions for the driveway, it's in an area that's -- when -- when the geotech developed these buildable areas, he was thinking of structures with foundations, as Mr. Kelley said. He wasn't -- and we've been calling them no development areas, but they would be -- there are areas outside of the sink areas that are not part of the buildable area that would have improvements in it, such as a driveway or the public sanitary sewer that's necessary to serve the lots. As far as disclosures, Kathy and Nate fully intend to disclose this. It's going to be shown on the plat as a not for development area. So when people -- and that will show up in people's title work as -- as we can make it a conservation easement or something, a type of an easement type thing that would make that show in title work as an exception to their title. So -- but, yeah. They -- the whole reason we're doing this is the way we're doing this is to allow the development of these large lots and still preserve the sinkholes without disturbing. If you remember Breckenridge to the north of this, it was very similar to that, and there's no recognition of those sinkholes left. So that is not our intent here, is basically not going to have, you know, hardly any grading, just enough to build a driveway and to build a house.

MS. GEUEA JONES: All right. Thank you very much. Questions for this speaker? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Is there a conservation easement marked on the plat?

MR. GEBHARDT: It's shown, Brad, as not -- a non-buildable area. Right?

MS. CARROLL: Unbuildable.

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. Everything -- there's a note on the plat that states anything outside the buildable areas are not for development, basically.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Is the -- is the geotechnical engineer present tonight?

MR. GEBHARDT: No.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I noticed 803, the buildable area is pretty small. I mean, relatively speaking. It's got a lot of land, but not buildable land. Is the -- I don't know how to ask this question. I mean, of course, you think it was worth doing, but I would lean toward just having three.

MR. GEBHARDT: Ms. Placier, I understand, but the scale of this is kind of offputting. You're used to seeing residential lots that are really small, normal. That's a very large lot. The buildable area in there, although it's smaller than the others --

MS. PLACIER: Uh-huh.

MR. GEBHARDT: -- we work -- we work with the geotech to make sure that, you know, they can get probably a 7,000 square foot home on there. So it's plenty big for anything that anyone would want to -- want to do. It just looks really small because the lot is big.

MR. KELLEY: If I may, I did that work. I should have said something. It is an 18-and-a-half-acre site. So getting to Jay's point, this is a rather large site for four R-1 lots.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier, are you --

MS. PLACIER: Oh. I'm okay. Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I -- I have a similar question, and then I'll get to you, Commissioner MacMann. Does anyone know, either staff or you, Mr. Gebhardt, how big approximately the houses are on the bottom of the preliminary plat on the lots that I know aren't part of this, but they're marked, like, 2012 or 12 -- 2013.

MR. GEBHARDT: The lots are probably right around 7,000, 7,500 square feet. The homes on them are mostly slabs, and they're probably in that 1,500, 1,600 square foot range.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. So average.

MR. GEBHARDT: Average.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Average homes. Okay. That's a little bit helpful because without having my ruler out, it's hard to figure out what that area is, but I can kind of make that comparison, so -- thank you. Commissioner MacMann, did you have something else?

MR. MACMANN: I did. Thank you, Madam Chair. I can verify. I was there two days ago. That's about how big those -- they might go to 1,800, they might go to 8,000, but that's a pretty accurate representation of the size of those, just for comparison. I have a question for staff, if I may.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please?

MR. MACMANN: And this may be a building and site development question. Having done a fair amount of building myself, and I know Mr. Gebhardt doesn't control this, when these homes are built, when I'm doing the dirt work, I want to mow down every tree, and I want to go as wide as I can. Will there be anything that comes from building and site development to let the operating engineers know where they can and cannot take their bulldozers and graders and things of that nature? That may be a Mr. Zenner question. I mean, I don't know.

MR. KELLEY: I would think land -- I'm trying to think. If a land disturbance plan is required, then, yes, I think that would have to be shown on there. Pat, do you have anything?

MR. ZENNER: So you'll have grading -- the land disturbance plan will have grading limits. These parcels are all over one acre in size; therefore, tree preservation is required to be identified; that is if there are significant trees on the property or climax forest.

MR. MACMANN: It kind of depends on where you are. I mean, I was there.

MR. ZENNER: Yes. That is correct. Mr. Gebhardt probably can speak more to the -- to the tree canopy that's on this property, and/or Mr. Kelley can, as well. But that would be the -- the tree preservation plan that would have to come --

MR. MACMANN: I'm just -- I'm just concerned that, you know, I've got a 14-ton, you know, CAT 900 or CAT 9000, and you know --

MR. ZENNER: Ends up in the bottom of a sinkhole?

MR. MACMANN: That -- yeah.

MR. GEBHARDT: If I may, Mike?

MR. MACMANN: Yeah.

MR. GEBHARDT: The -- so we do a lot of large lots in the county. A lot of times, there's flood plains and other things that are -- have to be to -- and it's not uncommon for us to stake those in the field so that the builder can -- and usually it's the inspectors that ask the builders to do that so they can tell where those non-buildable areas, non-developable areas are.

MR. MACMANN: It would just be my hope that when building site comes on -- I think you guys have, compared to last year, this is a thousand percent better. I'm just wondering if the -- the strictures building and site will place, if they do stake that, you know, say, hey, keep your earth-moving equipment off this area. And I don't know -- I don't know the answer to the question, that's why I -- but I -- I know how a dozer operator is. It's, like, I need -- I will need to go where I need to go. But, thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner MacMann. Anyone else? Seeing none. Thank you, Mr. Gebhardt.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other members of the public to speak on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner discussion, or are we ready for a motion? Seeing no discussion, I would entertain a motion. Commissioner MacMann? Or, sorry.

MR. MACMANN: Commissioner Loe raised --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, well --

MS. LOE: Case 124-2023, move to approve Quail Creek West Plat 8 preliminary plat.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That is moved by Commissioner Loe on Case Number 123-2023 and seconded by Commissioner Stanton.

MR. MACMANN: I have a point of order, Madam Chair?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please?

MR. MACMANN: I don't mean to be pedantic. I believe you said 124, Commissioner Loe.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's why I corrected the record when I restated the motion.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But thank you, Commissioner MacMann.

MS. LOE: Oh. The report says 124, which --

MS. GEUEA JONES: It is 123. Correct? It is 123?

MR. KELLEY: It should be 123. Good catch. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If I get a thumbs-up from legal, we'll move to a vote. Thank you. Commissioner Carroll, may we please -- or, sorry. Any discussion?

MR. MACMANN: I just wanted to make sure we were approving the right thing. That's all.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

Case Number 139-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering on behalf of Beacon Street Properties, LLC (owners), for approval of a one-lot final minor plat of M-C (Mixed-use Corridor) zoned property, to be known as "Bluff Creek Recreation Park, Plat No. 1." The 3.95-acre subject site is located east of the intersection of Old Highway 63, Bearfield Road, and Chinaberry Drive.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the final minor plat to be known as "Bluff Creek Recreational Park, Plat No. 1,"

pursuant to minor technical corrections.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Before we go to questions for staff, if any members of the Commission have had any contact with parties outside of these public meetings, please disclose now. Seeing none. Any questions for staff? Seeing none. Public comment, please?

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is anyone here to speak on this case? You know the drill.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. Just here to answer any question that you may have. Again, it's just a straightforward plat. All the properties around it have already been platted. It's basically a last remaining piece in that area. So happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much for your brevity.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any discussion on the case by Commissioners? Seeing none. Would anyone like to make a motion? Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. In the Case Number 139-2023, Bluff Creek Recreational Park, Plat 1, Final Plat, I recommend approval of Bluff Creek Recreational Park, Plat No. 1, pursuant to minor technical corrections.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Approval is moved by Commissioner Burns; seconded by Commission MacMann. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on.

Case Number 140-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Black Dog Consulting and Development, LLC,(owner) for approval of a 20-lot Preliminary Plat of R-2 (Two-family Dwelling) zoned property, to be known as Corriente Village. The approximately 3.28-acre subject site is located 60 feet northeast of the intersection of Parks Edge Place and Oakland Gravel Road and includes the address 3612 Oakland Gravel Road.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Brad Kelley of the Planning and Development Department. Staff

recommends approval of the preliminary plat to be known as Corriente Village.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of the members of the Commission have had any outside contact with parties, please disclose that now. Seeing none. Any questions for staff? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there anyone here -- should have sat on the front row.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I have a presentation I'm happy to go through. However, we've been through this before. It came before this Commission in January. The rezoning was approved by City Council in February, and then we went to the Board of Adjustment to get those cottage standards in March. And so this is the last step for this project before this Commission. So happy to answer any question that you may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick, Mr. Crockett. Anything of note change?

MR. CROCKETT: I'm sorry?

MR. MACMANN: Did anything of note change from when we saw it before?

MR. CROCKETT: No. No.

MR. MACMANN: It looks exactly the same to me.

MR. CROCKETT: Exactly the same. It's pretty -- I mean, maybe a couple of feet here and there, but nothing substantial whatsoever.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Then Adjustment said yea, so I'm happy with it. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any other members of the public who are here tonight to speak on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner discussion? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a quick comment and then I'll have a motion. I am pleased that a cottage standard project came through, and I am pleased before we have new standards out, and I am pleased that Adjustment let that happen. I'd like to thank staff and Mr. Crockett and the owners for making this happen. That said, I have a motion. In the matter of Case 140-2023, Corriente Village Preliminary Plat, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner MacMann; seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Placer, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That motion will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to public hearings and subdivisions.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND SUBDIVISIONS

Case Number 49-2023

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Kanco, LLC (owner), seeking approval of a multi-tract zoning map amendment. The 30.7-acre property is unimproved and currently zoned R-MF (Multi-family Dwelling) and M-OF (Mixed-use Office). The proposed rezoning would rezone Tract 1 to M-C (Mixed-use Corridor), rezone Tract 2 to M-N (Mixed-use Neighborhood), and rezone Tract 3 to M-OF. The site is located on the south side of New Haven Road, east of the existing Lenoir Street. (This request was previously tabled at the February 23, 2023 public hearing.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report as given by Mr. Brad Kelley of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to M-C for Tract 1, M-N for Tract 2, and M-OF for Tract 3.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I -- just one quick one, just yes or no. Would you be amenable to me reading out the next case, and also doing that staff report? No? I'm getting a shaking no from the person in charge. Okay.

MR. ZENNER: We need to make sure that the public record is maintained separately. There has been some concern expressed with the muddling of our minutes when we present this back to City Council.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very well. Thank you, Manager Zenner. In that case, before we go to questions for staff, if anyone has had any outside contact with parties to this case, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, I saw your hand.

MS. CARROLL: Will the MoDOT improvements at -- near this development include improvements to sidewalks along the outer road?

MR. KELLEY: I believe that will be constructed by the developer with their development.

MS. CARROLL: Well, there's currently sidewalks -- yeah. So there's the stretch just along Lenoir Woods all the way until you get to the newer road section close to Discovery. None of that has sidewalk, so they'll install sidewalks directly in front, but it's not necessarily walkable from Lenoir Woods.

MR. KELLEY: Right. I don't think there's sidewalks now. Correct. Right.

MS. CARROLL: And there's nothing to trigger that? Okay. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: Or there was a design adjustment associated with the platting of the Lenoir

Woods project that waived sidewalk construction along that portion of Lenoir Street. That is why it is not there.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. When -- when did that occur?

MR. ZENNER: That occurred prior to the construction of -- at the onset of the construction of their most recent expansion internal to the campus itself.

MS. CARROLL: Do you know an approximate year?

MR. ZENNER: Before you were -- I don't remember the year, but it was before your time on the Commission.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I didn't see any response from the University, the Research Farm had no input?

MR. KELLEY: I didn't receive anything.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing -- oh, sorry. Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: I noticed you received some responses from the Lenoir residents, and one -- at least one of them referred to walking down to these places. But if there is no sidewalk on which these elderly people are going to walk down to those places to enjoy them, is that a concern?

MR. KELLEY: I think there will be when -- when it's developed is the -- the key point there.

MR. ZENNER: I think, Ms. Placier, the waiver that was granted is granted with the Lenoir property. So what Mr. Kelley is referring to and what this platting action will do is it will result in sidewalks being built along that portion of the Lenoir Street relocation that MoDOT will be constructing. The piece that is then to the south of that, which is along Lenoir and their property, was given a waiver. So it is possible through separate petition of the City that sidewalk improvements may be able to be installed. But at this point if the transfer of Lenoir Street has not occurred, and I'm not sure if that is a MoDOT road or if it is ours, that would be a necessity before sidewalks could be placed within the State's right-of-way. And typically, we do not place sidewalks along expressways. That is expressly excluded from the requirements of our Code, which would have been the outside, the western side of the Lenoir Street right-of-way immediately adjacent to the 63 corridor. The variance at the time that the subdivision plat was approved was for the eastern frontage. And hence, there is also a drainage feature that separates the very southerly portion of the subject tract from the Lenoir parcel, which would need to be somehow addressed with a sidewalk connection project in the future.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Carroll, quickly.

MS. CARROLL: To be absolutely clear about this statement, you do have a sidewalk along that frontage as it turns just past Lenoir Street into New Haven Road or -- yeah. On that outer right at the

other end of Lenoir Street. The application, the applicant would provide sidewalks on the frontage of their site, the area between New Haven Road to the new development, including the area in front of Lenoir Street, will not have a sidewalk and does not currently have a sidewalk.

MR. KELLEY: Sorry. I'm looking back --

MS. CARROLL: There is a sidewalk for part of this currently. I have walked on this sidewalk, and I'm looking at a picture of it right now.

MR. KELLEY: On the east side? Okay.

MS. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. KELLEY: It may not have -- so it wasn't shown on my aerial, so maybe there's a discrepancy between the year this was taken and when -- when that was from.

MS. CARROLL: It's quite new, actually.

MR. KELLEY: Okay.

MS. CARROLL: They put it in maybe two years ago.

MR. KELLEY: Okay.

MS. CARROLL: And this was viewed as an amazing amenity to the folks that worked at Radel and at Eurofins. It doesn't connect to Lenoir Woods. I think what I'm getting at here is that this is an amazing -- I -- I completely agree that this is a autocentric destination just because its connectivity, but what I'd like us to be aware of is that there's an awful lot of non-drivers living in Lenoir Woods who don't have a lot of destinations, and I hope that our City pays attention to how we're serving those folks. I think that this will be -- this development will be a good amenity for them, as it will be to the people on the northeast side of the highway there. Nonetheless, I don't know what our policy is saying we can't have sidewalks on that outer road, because we've already -- it's installed sidewalks on part of it. It may have been applicant driven, but it's there.

MR. KELLEY: When you're referring to the outer road, are you referring to Lenoir Street right here? That's -- yeah. What Pat is highlighting is the Lenoir -- current configuration of Lenoir Street.

MS. CARROLL: Past there.

MR. ZENNER: Here?

MS. CARROLL: So as you get over closer to -- so close to Lenoir Street and New Haven, there are no sidewalks. In front of Lenoir Woods, there's no sidewalks. Then there's a lot that is not yet developed, but there was a recent application for that.

MR. KELLEY: Oh. Yeah, Down here --

MS. CARROLL: A little bit farther down.

MR. KELLEY: Yeah.

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. And just slightly below that map is where the sidewalk begins.

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. I know where you're talking about now.

MS. CARROLL: I can see that -- say that people do walk this section quite a bit. There are

trails that go off onto some of the land there. People would walk it and people do walk in the road there. There has been a traffic accident with a cyclist on the road there, as well. We should pay attention to our pedestrian amenities, particularly in there, and it's particularly as we add destinations for pedestrians to go to and very likely disabled persons.

MR. ZENNER: I'd like to point something out here just for the purposes of context. So as Mr. Kelley pointed out, you'll notice from this aerial photography that this is where the old nursing home was located. It has been removed. But you will notice where my cursor -- where the arrow is down here. This was originally a connection that was provided between the nursing facility and the -- or Lenoir Woods and the nursing home itself. I'm not quite sure, and Mr. Gebhardt may be able to respond to this. That connection may still exist. It may still be able to be improved for the purposes of creating an internal connection to a portion of this project that would then get you to a public sidewalk that would be built on the relocated portion of Lenoir Street, but I will let Mr. Gebhardt refer to that as it relates to potentially the property owner's willingness to maybe explore that in order to allow for access of the residents of Lenoir Woods. However, at this point, the only options that probably exist, if Lenoir Street is within the City system for maintenance purposes, would probably a petition through our capital improvement project process by which to have a sidewalk identified for this particular area. We would also have to look to find out what is on our most current sidewalk master plan, which I don't believe this particular area identifies. So with that being said, that's all I think we may have to offer here unless you have additional questions.

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. I would just say one more thing. It was kind of getting to the preliminary plat part, but Lenoir Street is going to be reconfigured to swing to the east and kind of come to the central point here, kind of almost near where this -- see the wooded area. But the point I want to make is on the south side of that, which would be closer to Lenoir Woods where you're talking about, that would be an eight-foot pedway on -- on that site -- on that side, and on the other side, I guess that would be a five-foot sidewalk. But we can talk more about the preliminary plat or Jay could comment on it during public comment.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks. Yeah. I'm just trying to understand the statement that we don't allow sidewalks to be built along the expressway given that there's currently one existing.

MR. KELLEY: I would say a difference probably between outer road and expressway itself.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Seeing no other -- Commissioner MacMann, quickly.

MR. MACMANN: Just quickly. And this is probably a Mr. Zenner question. Mr. Zenner, mining your intense knowledge of the City of Columbia, am I correct in stating the closest grocery store to this location is the Hy-Vee due west of it, about two miles-ish away?

MR. ZENNER: That would be correct, sir.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you very much.

MS. CARROLL: There's an Aldi that's closer now.

MR. MACMANN: To the north?

MS. CARROLL: It's still to the west. So as you go down Grindstone --

MR. ZENNER: Oh, I apologize. You're correct.

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. Right next to --

MR. ZENNER: And that is at Grindstone -- Grindstone and Green Meadows is where the Aldi's is, and Walmart, then you would have the superstore Walmart.

MS. CARROLL: Walmart.

MR. ZENNER: A little bit closer, but still probably about a mile and a half.

MS. CARROLL: Same traffic light.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I'm -- I'm -- food deserts in the future because we're growing this way. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Moving on to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Who wants to start? You know how this goes.

MR. COLBERT: Yes, ma'am. Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the Commissioner. Caleb Colbert, attorney, at 827 East Broadway. It sounds like most of the questions tonight are going to be on the plat, so I'll just hit on some of the zoning issues real quick. Mr. Kelley is correct that the request you have before you tonight is sort of in response to MoDOT deciding that it's going to improve the 63/New Haven interchange. So when they came to us about three years ago and said this project was coming forward or that improvement was coming forward, they told us that they were going to realign Lenoir Street. And as you can see there in the middle of that zoning exhibit, Lenoir Street is going to be rerouted to the east, and basically cut this property sort of in half. So once they told us that they were going to bisect the property, we looked and said, okay, well, what zoning classifications are appropriate for this location in light of this change. And again on the west, you have a freeway to the north, New Haven is considered a minor arterial, and then Lenoir Street is considered a major collector. So all in all, you have property that is surrounded by a freeway, an arterial, and a collector. Again, that's sort of the textbook definition M-C zoning or where M-C zoning is appropriate. So we started at that intersection with the freeway and New Haven with M-C. And then as approached other property owners, we stepped down to less than ten zoning districts. We have M-N there on the east, which will provide a transition to the MU property, which is a research facility. And then you have M-OF to the south, which provides a transition to the Lenoir property. So all in all, again, we tried to follow the best practices, concentrate the M-C zoning at the intersections and the major roadways, and step down as we moved out from sort of the central zoning. That's the zoning in a nutshell. I would be happy to answer any questions. Jay Gebhardt is here to talk about the plat, questions on the sidewalks. And Julie Nolfo is here; she's our traffic engineer, happy to answer questions on the traffic study.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much for being here tonight.

MR. COLBERT: All right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next?

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. My name is Jay Gebhardt, civil engineer and land surveyor for A Civil Group, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. I'll just answer the sidewalk question, since it's not a zoning issue, but it's a plat. But MoDOT is building the sidewalk on the relocated Lenoir to -- to our property line, to our south property line. They're building a sidewalk on the north side of New Haven, and they're building a sidewalk on the south side of New Haven through their project. Any sidewalks that they do not build will be built by the developer. So internally and on the exterior of this, there's -- there's plenty of pedestrian access. The traffic signal is being designed so that it would accommodate that traffic. As far as Lenoir, I understand your concerns. We are -- we have a good relationship with the administration there and trying to determine what is the best for the residents in this. And there -- as Pat said, there is a road there for the old road access, and the bridge is still intact over the creek, so it would provide an easy path should they choose that that's what they want. We don't want to necessarily do something and then they end up getting people that they don't want internal to their -- through that. So it's -- it's an issue that needs to be worked out, but it's -- it's something that my client is very interested in -- in addressing, because the Lenoir people have been very supportive of him on this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Gebhardt, a question and then a comment. The light you're referring to is the one at Lemone? Is that what you were --

MR. GEBHARDT: There is a light at Lemone, but I'm referring to the light at Lenoir and New Haven.

MR. MACMANN: That would be a new light there?

MR. GEBHARDT: There will be a new light signal at both locations.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Okay.

MR. GEBHARDT: For the -- for the off ramp and for the Lenoir.

MR. MACMANN: All right. The second thing I would like to say is that this can almost be in a textbook the way it's -- it's laid out properly. Thanks. Thanks.

MR. GEBHARDT: You can thank Mr. Zenner for that.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner MacMann. Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I just -- one question. The school being located across New Haven from the most intense commercial zoning, did you have any interaction with them? Were there any concerns?

MR. GEBHARDT: We sure did. We -- so this project started for me in 2019. And -- and during that time, we've met with -- I've met with the CPS folks three times, and the last time was just probably in January or February, right before we were getting ready to come to Planning and Zoning the last time. And Randy Gooch is their operations manager. And he basically gave us the thumbs up for this project. He -- he didn't feel like it was going to interact negatively with the school, and MoDOT is being really careful to work with them to get the buses and the parent drop-off and all that coordinated so that there's not any kind of issue with that. So he seemed to be satisfied with the improvements and with the rezoning and the platting of property.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Anyone else? I have a quick question, and I'm sure there's a simple answer. Why the odd shape of tract 1 and tract 3? Is there a natural feature there that I'm not realizing?

MR. GEBHARDT: Tract 3 is the existing zoning, and it is the -- MoDOT is building a large regional detention facility on it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. GEBHARDT: And that's the shape of the detention facility.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. So it's a maximization. Excellent. I knew there was a simple answer, I just couldn't see it. Okay. Seeing -- Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Sorry. You mentioned that MoDOT will be building the sidewalks along the area that they're improving, as well as placing a traffic light, which is a needed feature. The traffic getting across there is quite bad for the increased -- increased traffic as it is. Will they -- they're building sidewalk along the north and south side of New Haven for Lenoir. Are they doing the same along New Haven itself; do you know?

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes. Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

MR. GEBHARDT: So I believe it's a pedway on the north side because of the school.

MS. CARROLL: Got it.

MR. GEBHARDT: And on the south side, I think it will be a five-foot sidewalk --

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. GEBHARDT: -- but they are building those.

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. There's currently --

MR. GEBHARDT: So MoDOT is basically building the sidewalks except for the north side of Lenoir, which is what we're -- we've agreed to build.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Good?

MS. CARROLL: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Anyone else here to speak on the zoning? You can also wait till we get to the traffic planning part of it if you want. Okay. Sorry. We normally do these kinds of cases together. Please come forward. State your name and address for the record. Pull that microphone down to you. Jay is way taller than you. Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Hello

MS. GEUEA JONES: Hi.

MS. SMITH: Hi. Hi. My name is Sherrece Smith, and I reside at 3501 East New Haven Road, Number 27, Columbia, Missouri 65201. I am a Woodstock resident. I felt the need to come in person so that way you would have a face. Currently what I am hearing are the concerns of the residents of Lenoir, which is valid. I have history with Lenoir. My cousin passed away in the facility that ultimately was destroyed and then, thankfully moved onto Lenoir campus. I vote at Lenoir Senior Center. My concern is not only the traffic, which they have thankfully kind of worked out the kinks to me as far as having a center lane, but I do have a concern about our young families, our seniors, our retirees, those who do not drive for whatever reason, being able to cross the street. I do understand that there is an additional traffic light system that will be set up. That will be located across from my neighborhood, as I believe is correct. So, you know, I wish sometimes they would refer to on the Woodstock side. Another concern I have is that as far as I believe, we're kind of like the last pocket of county, and we're surrounded by University and City. I grew up and I went to school in the south part of Columbia near Pierpont all the way to Providence where even Rock Bridge Elementary School is, I went to there. I graduated from Rock Bridge Senior High School. I remember when there -- when Walmart was built. I remember when Taco Bell was built. I remember when the trees used to be around, but that's beside the point. My main concern is I realize that it -- that we must progress as we're a growing population, and as my county is dwindling at a quick speed. My concern yet again is the traffic and keeping the people in mind that are there. My neighborhood is there. It has been there for, I believe, 50 years. I have not been there for 50 years, but it has been there for 50 years. Part of the reason why you're not seeing a lot of traffic along the outer road of what's called Lenoir Street, it's because neighborhoods were taken down and removed. There used to be a lot of people that would walk those sidewalks. There would be people that would cross down the bank to cross over to Highway 63. And I just want you to be aware of that. What it looks like to me personally is that this is another Clark Lane. That's kind of what it looks like to me. And you're kind of frowning, but it's because, to me, the future is looking like a lot of business is going to be right across from us. The rents are going to be shot up. That's besides the point; that's just the way it goes and, you know, we'll it out somehow -- some of us. But, still, there will be people -- there will be pedestrians, there will be bikes, there will be non-cars. And I just want to make sure that our children are considered and that they are safe. There were concerns that were brought up in the first meeting. They have been addressed, so I'm going to give credit where credit is due. But as I am looking at this being more of a mixed commercial, housing, and I'm thinking about the time where they

were considering expanding mental health by having a Fulton hospital just down the road, and it was what -- it was voted down because of what, traffic. But now that they're moving Lenoir over to us in our front yard, I just want it to be known that I am not alone in my thoughts and my feelings. I am representing a diverse neighborhood.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much for being here tonight. Give us just a minute. Does anyone have any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. Commissioner Stanton was raising his hand, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, sorry.

MR. STANTON: The proposed sidewalks, do you think that's adequate enough to safely transport pedestrian traffic from Woodstock anywhere?

MS. SMITH: I believe that the improvements that are being done, that MoDOT is proposing, is definitely needed. I also have a shout out for the State employees and other people that have to park in that commuter lot in hopes of saving gas, so that way they can make their way to Jefferson City or to wherever else they need to go. I haven't heard any solution about where that is being placed. Sixty -- AC 63 is the heart. I have gone without a car and thankfully somebody was able to get just far enough to me where we could travel together to Jefferson City. These are real issues; these are real problems. So I want that to be noted, too. I would love to know where that commuter lot is going to be for employees who are trying to just make it to work. As far as the sidewalks, it sounds like they're going to kind of be parallel along, I guess, the New Haven, which I agreed with. It's -- it's necessary. I am concerned about crossing on the other side, the traffic going back and forth. I don't know if some -- I don't know if I have to go to a different meeting on that. If so, I will be here, but that is a main concern. And like I said, we do have children. We have adults that do ride bikes. They do ride those little mopeds. They are actually walking all the way over to Walmart and to Aldi's to either work or to shop the best they can, putting it on their backs and traveling back. So I understand that there is some benefit of having a mixed-use commercial, but I do not want it to be like a Clark Lane. Thankfully, we will have sidewalks, and I'm hoping Clark Lane will get theirs, too. But that's -- that's about all I have to say on this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I am so thankful for you coming out and being here tonight because this is exactly what I want to hear. You're exactly who I want to hear from, and my concerns about sidewalk are, in part, due to you and your community. I used to spend a lot of time at this exact area. I work -- no longer. I used to work at this area. The sidewalks there are a problem, the traffic there is a problem. We -- I -- I see people walking it and biking it all the time. I see people walking along the grass. I see people trying to cross. It's not a safe crossing for the cars going across Lenoir Woods, across New Haven with pedestrians there because it's too close to the exchange, it's not signalized, and there's nothing to mark the flow of traffic.

MS. SMITH: Yeah.

MS. CARROLL: It's dangerous, and I have seen accidents. And that's because of increased traffic in the area, because of increased development in the area. This development is something that I've been awaiting for a long time because the addition of sidewalks is needed so much, and I was hoping that it would make the situation better for you. I guess, you know, my real question was -- I mean, do you see people from your neighborhood, do you see them as people who would walk along these sidewalks to use this service? With this -- will the services in this commercial zone, will it serve your neighborhood, or will it be a feature that inconveniences your neighborhood? How does your neighborhood feel about it?

MS. SMITH: Well, I kind of feel a certain way about having unhealthy foods so readily available, but that's I guess, another issue. My concern is, can we afford to go shopping? Can we do it? Will it be enough to support our families should we decide to work there? I don't know. But those are questions that should be on the forefront, especially since I realize that the City has been trying to make a huge effort of being inclusive and trying to assist people of all backgrounds as much as possible. And I do realize that there is a huge growing pain going on in Columbia. I do realize that. I do realize I'm going to lose that field, but I also realize that there are people, single mothers who out walking all the way to Walmart and Aldi's. Now, I'm just going to keep it real. It's real. There's no bus. There's no City bus near us. When there was, you had to walk near Marriott Hotel in order to get there. That's on the other side of the school. And the times were terrible, and I'm sorry to say that, they did what they could, I guess, but it just wasn't working for a person that's trying to level up.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. My question is -- is about the zoning going in. I mean, we -- we've been encouraging people to do straight zoning instead of pretending like they know what's -- we're going to sell to. Right? M-N zoning is not drive-throughs, it's not super heavy development. It's more grocery stores, neighborhood stores, things like that, that's closest to your neighborhood. And if I'm reading the MoDOT map right, which is hard to do, I think there will be a sidewalk all the way down to the light and around that intersection.

MS. SMITH: Impasse -- impassed it, as they say, back into a two lane?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. Yeah.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It looks like it goes all the way to -- what is that road that intersects Warren?

MS. SMITH: At Warren Drive, maybe.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. JONES: Which is, like, right on the edge, so it's like they're --

MS. GEUEA JONES: It looks like, just the piece that they have us because it's relevant to this particular section, it may go even further than that. I don't know about that part. But the section they

gave us shows sidewalk all the way from Warren Drive to past the new Lenoir Street. There's sidewalk, it looks like, on both sides. Again, if I'm reading this right, which is hard to do. But again, like this is the zoning question and -- and we certainly will take your comments into consideration when we get to the plat --

MS. SMITH: The mixed neighborhood part -- excuse me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MS. SMITH: The mixed neighborhood part, I get that. It would be nice if maybe it was more affordable. I do realize that the location that it will be at, that might not be likely.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Why do you say that? Say more.

MS. SMITH: Because of the location that it is. The reason why -- I can live anywhere. The reason why I chose where I lived is because it was county. It was quiet, I was right there by the highway. I could get to work at a good time. I could go downtown within 15 minutes. Now it's probably more like 20 minutes. You know, I personally drive, so I was close to, you know, every little -- like, I like driving along the highway, so it didn't take me long to go to Stadium or to Broadway Exit, or to shoot -- to go to, you know, St. Louis, or to Kansas City. So I see that area, and on top of it, because of the good nursing homes that's near there, we have a gas station. Do you see what I'm saying? What I'm saying is there's convenience, and what they're saying is they're bring more convenience. Not particularly with that M-N, but where there's the M-C potential, which is what I was kind of referring to was the M-C because of the other, I guess.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I see.

MS. SMITH: But the M-N part, you know, I do know -- realize that as far as building and stuff is concerned, the money is the higher end, and that's kind of another concern for me and my neighborhood.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I would hope that developers would take into account the many, many people, not just in your neighborhood, but also across the highway. There are also quite a lot of folks over there that I'm sure would prefer something closer. Thank you very much for your time. Anyone else, questions? Thank you very much. We really do appreciate you being here. Any other public comment? Next? Okay. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner discussion. And I just want to keep us on focus because Council has asked us to separate these questions. We are talking about zoning right now. We'll talk about sidewalks in a minute, I promise. Any questions on -- or any discussion on zoning? Okay. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners do not have any more questions or concerns, I will make a motion. In the matter of Case 49-2023, rezoning 3300 New Haven Road, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner MacMann; seconded by Commissioner

Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Wilson, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Voting No: Ms. Placier, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 6-2.

MS. CARROLL: We have six yes, and two no. The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

Case Number 50-2023

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Kanco, LLC (owner), seeking approval of a 14-lot preliminary plat. The 30.7-acre property is unimproved and currently zoned R-MF (Multi-family Dwelling) and M-OF (Mixed-use Office). The proposed layout would create 14 commercial lots with zonings of M-C, M-N, and M-OF. The site is located on the south side of New Haven Road, east of Lenoir Street. (This request was previously tabled at the February 23, 2023 public hearing.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Brad Kelley of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat to be known as South Rock Subdivision pursuant to minor technical corrections.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Before we got to questions for the staff report, which apparently there are some. Did anyone have any contact with parties on this case outside of these public hearings? If so, please disclose those now. Seeing none. Questions for staff. Would anyone like to start before me? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Can you go to the MoDOT, and can you clarify for us where the extent of the sidewalk and also just -- we're trying to figure out where the M-C starts and ends, and relative to where the driveways, the roads are located, and sidewalks are located.

MR. KELLEY: Okay. I'm going to go back to this graphic then.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. KELLEY: Lots 106, 107, 108 here on the top right fronting New Haven, and Lot 109 would -- well, just say 106, 107, and 108 would be M-N. Most of 109 would be M-N till about down here, I believe. One eleven would be M-OF, and then the remainder, a portion of this, and then all the other lots would be M-C.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And where are the sidewalks?

MR. KELLEY: Along the street frontages, parallel to Lenoir Street, from the southern boundary, then parallel to New Haven up here once the streets intersect.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And how far to the east?

MR. KELLEY: Just what's shown on the preliminary plat. It's along the boundaries of the

property line. I don't know specifics of the MoDOT project beyond this specific point. I think Jay has raised his hand and could answer that when we get to public comment.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT OPEN

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. My name is Jay Gebhardt, civil engineer and land surveyor with A Civil Group, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. It seems there's some confusion on the sidewalks thing, so, Brad, can you zoom?

MR. KELLEY: No, I cannot.

MR. GEBHARDT: Okay. So can you go back to the MoDOT plans --

MR. KELLEY: Yes.

MR. GEBHARDT: -- for them? Okay. So you see the intersection of Lenoir and New Haven. And then to the north of that, there's the driveways for the school. And to the right of that is the existing entrance to Woodstock Mobile Home Park. MoDOT is closing that entrance and relocating it across from our entrance there. We -- we observe the school let in and let out of times, and there is probably 50 children that come from Woodstock Mobile Home Park through a sidewalk directly to the school. They never come out to the street. They just come right over to the school. And so we asked MoDOT to address that because MoDOT's project ends at that Lenoir intersection. From that point on, it's a City/County street; County on the north and City on the south. And so MoDOT doesn't feel like it's their purview to build sidewalks across the frontage of Woodstock. But they -- what they did do is provide an internal connection, and they show that on their plans. It's kind of hard to see, but there is a sidewalk that they're building up to -- to make that connection to the existing connection from Woodstock. So the residents of Woodstock will be able to come down by sidewalk to the light, and at that light, they'll be able to have pedestrian hits. They'll be able to click a button to which direction they want to go, and then it'll stop lights and give them a countdown to come across the street. And that's true at Lenoir or Lemone also, but at Lenoir especially. And then MoDOT is -- a part of their project, even though Lenore Street will become a City street and not a MoDOT street, they're building it and they're building the sidewalk on the south side. What they're not doing is building a sidewalk on the north side, so the developer, my client, will be building that sidewalk. But as far as getting north-south across New Haven at that location, it will be as safe as any modern traffic signal is, and so that's the case. And then the connection there is that. And, Sharon, I think the line you see, that you've mistaken as a sidewalk, is just a water line and then a property line. It looks close together, so it looks like maybe it might be sidewalk. But that's the extent of the sidewalk on the Woodstock Mobile Home Park is that connection to the -- and it's -- like I said, it's already being used by the neighborhood for the children to get over to the school. MoDOT is going up and connecting to that, so there's a direct connection back to the sidewalk system on the north

side of New Haven, which they are building west of the intersection with Lenoir. And then, of course, they're building the sidewalk on the south side of New Haven to Lenoir Street on the south side east of Lenoir as part of our development. We will build sidewalks all the way to our east property line there. So I think the sidewalks are pretty -- have been thought out, and there's also bike lanes for -- being proposed on the road, and I -- I think the pedestrian and bike aspects of this has been thoroughly looked at by MoDOT. We also -- I just wanted to say that we did meet with -- we invited all of the owners at Woodstock neighborhood to a meeting at the school about three weeks ago, and we had about 15 people come and ask questions and we provided information to it. I'm going to give Sherrece my card tonight so that if she has any further questions on this, I would be a -- she'll be able to have -- directly contact me about it, and we can work -- work through those details or questions that she might have. Other than that, I mean, I would be glad to talk about anything else about this preliminary plat, but if you have more questions about the sidewalks or any other aspect of it, I would be happy to answer them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions from Commissioners? I know we -- for the record, and anyone reading just this case, we talked a lot about this during the previous case, so you should refer back to those minutes, as well. Thank you, Mr. Gebhardt.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next speaker? Welcome back.

MS. NOLFO: Thank you. Good evening. I am Julie Nolfo, a professional traffic operations engineer with Lochmueller Group, and we did perform a traffic impact study for this development with some assumed uses, which were very auto oriented in the M-C portion of it all. And I'm here happy to answer any questions if you have any that relate to traffic.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioners, any questions for this speaker?

MS. CARROLL: Did you take pedestrian counts when you did your traffic study?

MS. NOLFO: So the -- unlike a typical study, like, what we talked about a couple of weeks ago, this study was actually based in the year 2040 because we used MoDOT's traffic projections for the reconfigured interchange, and that was all done in -- when you do that, you do it in the future years, so 2040. So we didn't actually do counts and have pedestrians captured in there. That being said, when -- and I can empathize with you. These plans from MoDOT were challenging to decipher, but when we did look at them, in the sense that there are eight-foot pedways and six-foot pedways of essentially sidewalk accommodations being provided on both sides of New Haven, and it is so hard to see on that plan. But basically where they're closing that drive to Woodstock is where there's a sidewalk coming down through there, and then the developer's commitment to provide it along the side of the road, and then it's on both sides of Lenoir. I mean, that -- those are ideal pedestrian accommodations. And then, obviously, by having the new signal there, and making sure that there is pedestrian accommodations and push buttons. And I'm a big fan of the continental crosswalk versus just two parallel lines. So, hopefully, MoDOT will incorporate that in there, as well. Those are ideal pedestrian accommodations through here.

MS. CARROLL: Did you do linear traffic projections to 2040 and how do those --

MS. NOLFO: We took MoDOT's --

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

MS. NOLFO: -- 2040, and then what we did is we layered the proposed traffic on top of that.

MS. CARROLL: So how does MoDOT -- I guess you may not be able to answer this. How did they project it? Did they change their projections based on the change in location at all?

MS. NOLFO: I'm sure they did. We did not do the study. They hired another firm -- a great firm, but to do that, and looked at all various interchange configurations through there. But typically, so I cannot speak specifically to this, but having done a number of those types of studies myself, typically what happens is that you start with some base volumes, and then you grow them with a fairly aggressive growth rate, and then you look at surrounding land uses. So my guess is something was already assumed developmentwise probably for -- for this area. And you fold those all in and you develop 20-year forecasts, and then those are what you use for your evaluations of your interchange configurations and your road improvements. The traffic study we did, which was based off of their 2040 volumes, was provided to MoDOT, as well, and reviewed by them because they were just as curious as we were to make sure that what was being proposed was going to ample capacity. And it's unusual that when I'm looking 20 years into the future, I guess 17 now at this point, that you still see intersections functioning at level service C, which is a great operating condition.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: I live across from a grade school, so I'm just wondering was it still or what -- what were the grades during school hours?

MS. NOLFO: The focus in the traffic study was the a.m. and the p.m., so I cannot speak to the dismissal time period. Typically, the a.m.'s do capture also the arrival periods in there, but even with the development in, that was a level service C at the new signalized intersection, again in the year 2040. But there was no school dismissal analysis done as part of it. I will tell you that most schools want to have a signalized point of access, and so this will be an improvement to New Haven Elementary to have a signal for their access. But I cannot tell you a specific level of service for dismissal time.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other -- Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a point that will answer your question maybe. I used to drop off and pick up here, and it was the morning that was a nightmare. It wasn't so much the pickup, it was the drop off because you have people looping around and driving insanely, and there's not enough room, and a signal will make a big different.]

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MS. NOLFO: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: So if you captured the morning, you captured the biggest problem or the

largest problematic time. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions about the traffic study? Seeing none. Thank you so much for being here.

MS. NOLFO: Thank you all.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other public comment on the platting, sidewalks, traffic flow, et cetera? And we have yours on the -- if you want to come and say your name again, but we have them on the record still.

MS. SMITH: Sherrece Smith, Woodstock neighborhood. The little sidewalk that she is referring to probably will not be there or be sufficient for us to access simply because they -- our entrance is being moved further down towards Warren Drive. And by the way, we have two entrances. So the main entrance that has sewer -- well, water issues because it kind of floods whenever it rains, but they're moving that entrance. They're almost, like, flip -- they're, like, removing one of the homes and it's my understanding that they're moving it on the other side, which would be pretty much where our sidewalk currently is. So those homes are usually around 70 feet, so I'm not really quite sure what -- I wish that Woodstock management was here. Maybe they could lean on this. But I -- we don't really use that sidewalk. The kids mainly use that little sidewalk. Adults usually just go up on the -- the sidewalk -- I mean, up the driveway and onto to the -- the shoulder. I imagine that it would be similar to what they're doing now, but it's further down. But as far as that -- that little sidewalk part, I guess we'll be needing to do -- I don't know what's going to happen since that's a MoDOT situation, but it's not as smooth as you think it is. And then also I feel like that might be a little bit of a setup. What do I mean by that? What if a person is walking and maybe they're -- I don't know -- have a drink in their hand. I have no idea. We're in the County. Okay? We get -- I'm sure we get away with a lot more stuff. But they're walking onto this sidewalk onto now school property. Okay? If there's police there and there are police that do patrol the area, I'm guessing they'll be patrolling more since we'll be having more of a mixed use M-N, M-C area. I can see that getting a little hairy. But, you know, that's probably an extreme case, but I'm just saying this little sidewalk situation is -- is still not completely resolved.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker?

MS. CARROLL: I wanted to clarify something with staff as --

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MS. CARROLL: You're good. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Can we finish public comment first, please, and then during Commissioner comment, you can ask? Any other public comment? Seeing none. I will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comment? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: The MoDOT improvements, MoDOT changing the location of the drive, adding

the signalization, the sidewalks, changing the location of the entrance to Woodstock, that is going to happen regardless of this application. Correct? That's a MoDOT action?

MR. KELLEY: Yes. I believe so. And then just kind of add on to this topic, I have spoken with a representative of Woodstock Mobile Home Park. Didn't give me any comments for the rezoning of the preliminary plat. She just had comments for MoDOT, so I connected her with the MoDOT project manager. I know they've had a lot of lengthy discussions.

MS. CARROLL: So our votes on this subject won't change the placement of any sidewalks to Woodstock?

MR. KELLEY: I think the -- the right-of-way associated with this preliminary plat is pretty integral to MoDOT's project. So I think if there's not an avenue for right-of-way here, that may impact MoDOT. But I would -- that's my better question for the applicants.

MS. CARROLL: And secondly, I -- commissioner comment. I guess my understanding was that the intention was to provide a sidewalk along that frontage in place of the existing path that students use, which may not be as preferable, but may be more substantial; is that correct? I'm seeing nods.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm going to reopen public comments so we can get your questions answered, Commissioner. Please come forward, Jay.

PUBLIC HEARING REOPENED

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you. Jay Gebhardt, civil engineer, A Civil Group. Could you repeat your question, just so I can make sure I answer it correctly?

MS. CARROLL: The intent is to provide a sidewalk either by yourselves or by MoDOT. I'm assuming -- I'm understanding MoDOT, along the frontage by Woodstock so that the movement of the existing walkway that the students are using, they will now be using a public sidewalk?

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

MR. GEBHARDT: And also I just want to point out that the entrance is being removed. I don't know if that's going to remain green space, but it certainly could, and -- and provide access down to the intersection and -- and the sidewalk system, so --

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Thanks.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. I'm going to close public comment and reopen Commissioner comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT RECLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. Our speaker who mentioned Clark Lane gave me pause because these intersections on major highways do create a lot of intense use and traffic and they're -- they are autocentric. And I was trying to imagine a public school on Clark Lane around where Home Depot is, or

something like that. Or a -- a residential area along there, and that -- you know, I'm probably just speaking into the wind or something, but does every one of these intersections need to be so intensely developed, especially when there are already existing uses that could potentially be jeopardized? I just -- probably just blabbering.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are you finished, Commissioner Placier? Sorry.

MS. PLACIER: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Carroll, and then Commissioner MacMann.

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. I'm so sorry. I -- I just spend so much time in this area. The use and the traffic situation there is already quite bad. We have people darting across an outer road with no traffic flow, no signalization, no direction. It's bad. And moving that intersection farther away from the interchange is important. That needs to happen regardless of whether or not this plat happens because the existing conditions are not safe. The intensity already exists. It doesn't look like it when you drive that plat, but the intensity right across the street from there with the hotels, with the exchange that already exists with a lot of employment down that outer road, that already exists. And those employment scenarios are driving a lot of traffic. What's concerning to me here is that we have heavy traffic demands due to employment, due to shopping, directly next to heavy pedestrian demands due to the existence of the mobile homes, due to the existence of Lenoir Woods. These are both populations that have a higher incidence of non-drivers. And even due to the employment, the people who work in that area tend to walk. People are trying to walk over to the shopping centers that are not at all set up for pedestrian use. We have heavy pedestrian use here. We have heavy traffic here. We don't have any infrastructure here to support that. So, yeah. It's already a heavy use. I -- I want to see the infrastructure to support the already existing heavy use placed.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner MacMann, and then Commissioner Wilson?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to respond to Commissioner Placier's comment, and I think it's -- it's valid to -- and Ms. Sherrece, I'm sorry, ma'am. I don't remember your last name. I apologize. Clark was -- a couple of things. Clark was built out before anyone even thought of sidewalks. And it's really problematic because it's so heavily built. And as we all know here, the State failed miserably with intersections so bad that we're going to rebuild it again. I think the State has learned from that, and the number one thing that Commissioner Carroll presented was that moving Lenoir away from the major highway intersection is a big benefit. I'm up at the intersection of Clark Lane all the time. It's pretty much a nightmare, and it's very dangerous, and we have people jolt and killed there on a regular basis. This is dangerous. I'm down here a lot, too, because we have a lot of civilian traffic. Whether this development goes forward or not, MoDOT is going to address the immediate footprint, which I think is a benefit. So whether these folks do their thing, what MoDOT will do, and the fact that this can't open until those traffic side and pedestrian are addressed, I think this is a real benefit. Is it the optimal solution? It certainly is not. We have an autocentric -- and I deal with this every day with

affordable housing issues. We have an autocentric society. The highways, CATSO Plan, where that school is, where Lenoir is, were laid out based upon traffic flow with almost no consideration for Sherrece and her neighbors, or me dropping off a kid at -- and it's really problematic because we're shoehorning stuff in. I think this is a decent shoehorn. I really -- I really do, because they moved the intersection. One of the problems on the north side of Clark Lane is that they have five -- three to five options no matter which way you go at one intersection. It's not efficient, it's dangerous, whereas this will split -- that will cut those in half. So I'm not as -- I appreciate your concerns and I don't want another Clark Lane, because that's really problematic. But I think that MoDOT, whether our applicants move forward or not, is moving forward to address it, and I just wanted to address those issues. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I tend to agree with Commissioner Carroll. Having been a person who works, I do still work on Lemone Industrial Drive. The traffic is a nightmare going to work, coming from work. It is very difficult to get back out onto the street when you're coming off of Lemone Industrial Drive. It's -- if not impossible, because you really can't see the traffic coming from the left. So having some type of signal there is really needed and necessary. And to Commissioner Carroll's point, going there in the morning is a nightmare because a lot of times people are trying to go straight, but the people who are getting on the highway clog up all the traffic. So something needs to be done, and this may not be ideal, but it's going to be better than what's going on now.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner Wilson. Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. If I could just respond to that because I have no problems with the improvements in sidewalks, the signaling, the movement of Lenoir. There is a traffic problem there, obviously. I'm just saying it's not going to get better with the addition of all of these M-C uses. It's most likely to get worse. It's just that these improvements might make it flow better. We weren't going to make those improvements, I guess, just for the sake of the school and people who live there. We were -- there's profit to be made in developing this area, and I think that motivates a lot of this. But, you know, I just want to be clear. I'm not opposing doing something about the traffic there since it's obviously a problem. But I'm trying to separate -- I mean, we can't separate it. It's one proposal. We can't separate -- we can't say we want the good stuff from MoDOT and we don't want the drive-through, convenience mart, car wash, yadda, yadda, yadda. So I don't know. I'm going to be torn about this. Go ahead.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe? I'm sorry. Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Twice now.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We can't -- that's true. That is twice tonight. We also can't take a vote until Commissioner Loe returns, so --

MS. CARROLL: That's very flattering. I rather like Commissioner Loe. So there is a silver

lining to this, and there's something that -- you know, the comment that I -- we kind of lost here, and Commissioner MacMann briefly alluded to was the food desert. And, granted, there are quite a few grocery stores a bit down the way. They're very difficult for the residents of Woodstock and the residents of Lenoir to reach. I can also attest to the fact that the folks that work at Radel and the folks that work at Eurofins get a 30-minute break at best, and they can't make it to the restaurants that are around -- mostly circled up around Nifong and Grindstone. So, you know, it's actually a lot of traffic in a 30-minute hike out there. They can't get there, and there's -- there's nowhere to grab a quick bite. And, you know, I get that quick food is not a healthy option, and it's not the best. I do think that this makes the grocery stores more reachable for the walkers, for the bikers, for the non-drivers. I also think that it puts food where people need it, even if it's maybe not the best food, I would hope.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner Carroll. Any further comments, and if not, I would entertain a motion. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a comment, and then I have a motion. Thank you, Commissioner Carroll, because I brought the grocery stores up -- grocery store up for that very reason. There is not one on that side of the highway. And I just want us all to keep in mind, as we see more and more cases on the east side. We work on a west area plan, we've got a northeast area plan, the south sort of has a plan. We're doing a lot out here and there's no plan, and we're going to need some grocery stores. Hint, hint to our developer friends. We need some grocery stores out here. With that in mind, if there are other -- no other questions or concerns, I have a motion. In the matter of Case 50-2023, South Rock Preliminary Plat, I move to -- before I say that -- do you need any technical questions on this?

MR. KELLEY: No. They were --

MR. MACMANN: They've evolved -- they've integrated into the paperwork. Yes, we're good?

MR. KELLEY: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval has been moved by Commissioner MacMann and seconded by Commissioner Stanton. If there is no discussion on the motion, Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll. Voting No: Ms. Placier, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 6-2.

MS. CARROLL: The vote is six to two; the motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is that the final vote count?

MS. CARROLL: I will vote no. So it goes to Council.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. For those of you who are wondering what just happened there. That recommendation will be moved to Council. But not having a unanimous vote, by having

three no votes, this is moved off of the consent calendar for City Calendar, so that they will have to consider it as a separate case.

MS. CARROLL: I will suggest that it is a very significant development, that does have broad meaning warranting Council consideration.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner MacMann, before we move on, did you have something.

MR. MACMANN: I was thinking that this would be a perfect time for a respite, but that's your call.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think we can take breaks as we continue to move. You are free to take a break as long as we still have six people sitting.

MR. MACMANN: Please go ahead.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We have a lot to do; otherwise, I would. I don't want to be here till midnight, if at all possible. Thank you all very much. Moving on to our next case.

Case Number 96-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Mid-Am Development, LLC (owner), seeking approval to rezone 18.32 acres of property from M-OF (Mixed use-Office) to M-C (Mixed use-Corridor). A concurrent request, (Case Number 95-2023) proposing a 13-lot preliminary plat upon the site of 24.49 acres is also being presented under separate cover. The subject site is located at the southeast corner of Providence Road and Veterans United Drive and includes a portion of Lot 1A of State Farm Subdivision-Block 2.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning of that northern 18.32 acres of the subject tract from M-OF to M-C.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Before we get to questions for staff, if any Commissioner has had any contact with parties to this case outside of these public hearings, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Any questions for staff? Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Are there any conversations with Columbia Public Schools?

MR. ZENNER: No, there have not been, and not that we had. We had no commentary provided back to us by administration for Rock Bridge. Currently, there is a crossover on the north side of this intersection that would get you over to the medical park. There is not -- as we went through the evaluation of the project, there is no similar crossover along the southern portion of the intersection. There is sidewalk along both the north and south sides of Veterans United Drive at this point, so -- and there is a -- there is a crossover across the western side of the Southampton intersection. We felt it important to make sure that that connection existed, so students would be able to either get on the trail, because the City has a trail that runs along the west side of Providence, and be able to cross over. We

also have addressed the issue of getting internal connectivity into the development from the intersection. That was addressed as a part of the development agreement with additional pedestrian improvements. So the applicant has indicated at least tentatively that there are two potential users of the property at this point, one being a commercial lot at the intersection at the corner that would basically be a financial institution, and then potentially a non-drive-through restaurant for an internal parcel within the development at this point. So two uses that potentially would be capable of being accessed pedestrianwise by the surrounding workers of the area. That restaurant, however, may serve multiple purposes.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I think the staff report kind of played up the attraction of maybe the students at Rock Bridge. It doesn't sound like a bank and sit-down restaurant is going to be the kid magnet, but --

MR. ZENNER: You never know.

MS. PLACIER: You never -- yeah. You never know. These kids might have money to deposit or spend. But the -- are there any uses that close to a school that -- that are -- I don't know-- ruled out or anything like that?

MR. ZENNER: So given the proximity of --

MS. PLACIER: Like the -- like a pot store, you know.

MR. ZENNER: Given the proximity, at least for the immediately adjoining uses, possibly Lots 1 through -- and this would be up along Veterans, so that would Lot 1, 3, -- 3, 5 -- 3, 4, 5, possibly down to 6 or 7, and we'll see that on the preliminary, those may be too close for the purposes of medical -- for marijuana. However, if you get to the southern portion of the site, the distance and spacing standards that we have in our Code, which are 500 feet as the crow flies from parcel to parcel, that is a possibility that that -- at the southern end of the commercial development, that that would be permissible. However, we currently at this point do not have available medical marijuana dispensary licenses that are available. The State -- we have capped out our maximum at this point, and the State has not increased the total number statewide to allow for any additional licensed to be issued. We will be discussing, and I will bring this up during this evening's upcoming events. We will be discussing micro dispensary requirements that will be being brought forward, but is probably, given this environment, that may not necessarily be a likely location. I think what we anticipate seeing here, this is still a drivable location, and I think that we -- it's unfortunate that we cannot deny that reality. And while we have a very linear auto-oriented environment a half a mile to the north, we sit with almost 5,000 employees probably at VU on a daily basis. Another probably 300 to 400 at the medical facility, and then if the medical facility is expanded, we're getting a concentration of potentially when you look at all of the area down here, 7,000 individuals on a daily basis. Walking to this location and the multiple lots is what we see. I was not trying, as we wrote the staff

report, to play up the high school. However, I am a father of graduates from Rock Bridge, and I am very well acquainted with the athletic events that occur here. This site has been previously eyed for a hotel in order to capitalize on activities that occur down at Rock Bridge and being able to accommodate its use. So I think that there are a lot of different things that may be here -- additional office, additional residential, as well. And that's something that I think is -- this particular -- I wouldn't say it screams of M-C, but it is definitely a -- a tract that's got the right infrastructure in place, and then the traffic study, which we'll get into during this -- during the platting action really hammers that home.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions? Oh, I'm sorry. Are you finished, Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. Public comment

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. Again, as Mr. Zenner indicated, the subject tract is about 24 and a half acres, currently zoned M-OF, in which we're asking for just a little over 18 of it to be rezoned to M-C, and the rest of it being left as M-OF. And I apologize because my presentation tonight kind of blends the two requests together, so I'll try to do the best I can to -- to keep them spread apart. This -- this diagram here illustrates the preliminary plat, the lot layout, the lot configuration. What's depicted in yellow is what we're asking to be rezoned to M-C with the blue portion remaining M-OF. This is the preliminary plat itself. I'll go back to this -- well, this one you can see. The two -- the two main drives, those are existing access points that access the site, that go into Veterans United currently, so those are existing facilities, existing driveways. They have easements on there, and they have the right to utilize that property, even though it crosses my client's property. Some of those will be rebuilt and reconstructed with the configuration of this project as it moves forward. As Mr. Zenner indicated, we are located at a major signalized intersection, Providence Road, which is expressway, and then Veterans United Drive, which is a major collector, and then Corporate Lake Drive to the south is a neighborhood collector. We do believe that the M-C request is complimentary to the area given the uses that are out there currently -- the tremendous amount of employment that's out there. This site is identified as a commercial node by the City of Columbia, and so we believe that M-C has been thought out for this location and it's appropriate for this area. While we are -- I mean, this site is, you know, vehicular oriented, we do not want to rule out the walkable component. There's a lot of folks out here that we are wanting to cater to. If you look at what's already in place, Providence Road is already there. A lot of sidewalks are already in place alongside -- along Providence Road. They have the trail across the street, across Providence Road. There's sidewalks across on Southampton on the other side. On Veterans United, there's a sidewalk across our entire frontage. It goes all the way across the Veterans United property. It goes all the way to the roundabout to the east, and then it goes -- the sidewalk goes all the way back to Grindstone. On

the other side of Veterans United, there's an eight-foot pedway, I believe, and so that's already currently there. And so that connects a lot of these campuses together. This is the last piece that needs a little bit. So what we're proposing is we're having -- we're -- we will construct a sidewalk along Providence Road. We're also going to have sidewalks on both sides of our internal street networks that will tie not only the Veterans United campus into this campus, but it will also go in and it'll tie in the medical complex to the north. It will also go across and then tie at two locations at Corporate Lake, as well as -- excuse me -- Corporate Lake and Veterans United, both of those crossings across Providence will have pedestrian access points, as well, that will be constructed by the developer. We can get into that with the preliminary plat portion, but a lot of thought and consideration has been given to the walkable component to this. Whether or not the students at Rock Bridge use it, that's yet to be known, but the fact is is we don't want to have a position where they do use it and there's nothing for them to cross. And so as far as the rezoning goes, I think most of the rest of it is about the preliminary plat, the traffic study, and the offsite improvements that I would like to talk about at the preliminary plat stage. But with regard to the zoning, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other public comment here tonight on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comment on this case? Seeing none. Anyone want to make a motion? Okay. Commissioner Loe, would you like to make a motion?

MS. CARROLL: I raised my hand.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see you. I turned my head too quickly. Commissioner Carroll, what have you got?

MS. CARROLL: I will make a motion to approve the requested zoning of the subject tract from M-OF to M-C.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Could you restate it louder? I'm sorry.

MS. CARROLL: I will make a motion to approve the requested zoning on the subject tract from M-OF to M-C.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: In -- thank you. In Case Number 96-2023, Commissioner Carroll has moved to approve the change in zoning, and that was seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

Moving on to our next case.

Case # 95-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Mid-Am Development, LLC (owner), for approval of a 13-lot preliminary plat to be known as "Spring Brook" subdivision. A concurrent request (Case # 96-2023) seeking to rezone 18.32 acres of the site from M-OF (Mixed-use Office) to M-C (Mixed-use Corridor) is presented under separate cover. The subject 24.49-acre site is located at southeast corner of S. Providence Road and Veterans United Drive.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report.

MR. ZENNER: Yes, you may, ma'am. Apparently, we are getting a tremendous amount of static through the microphone system.

(Off the record.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: All right. We will come back to order. Let's see. Shall I restart with reading the case? Okay. All right. We have read the case and we are ready for our staff report, Mr. Zenner.

Case # 95-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Mid-Am Development, LLC (owner), for approval of a 13-lot preliminary plat to be known as "Spring Brook" subdivision. A concurrent request (Case # 96-2023) seeking to rezone 18.32 acres of the site from M-OF (Mixed-use Office) to M-C (Mixed-use Corridor) is presented under separate cover. The subject 24.49-acre site is located at southeast corner of S. Providence Road and Veterans United Drive.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed 13-lot preliminary plat to be known as "Spring Brook Subdivision".

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with parties to this case outside of these public hearings, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Any questions for staff? Seeing none. Public comment?

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. If you don't mind, if I can get switched back over? There we go. Okay. I want to pick off -- pick up where I left off last time. We've talked about the zoning, and now the preliminary plat. Again, we're looking at 13 lots, and as Mr. Zenner indicated, we want to develop this in phases. And part of that phasing will also have triggers with regards to the offsite improvements. Again, we're going to talk about -- we're looking at doing private streets. It's a little bit different, but certainly allowable. We are going to build them to City standards. We are going to have a third-party

testing agency to look at those and confirm that they are built accordingly. A comprehensive traffic study was completed for this area. We had a tremendous amount of input from the City and MoDOT. We completed it. We did all of their -- all the analyzation of the site, of the intersections. They want us to go back -- MoDOT wants us to go back and look at a couple of other specific items, and so we went back and did a VISSIM model of this as well to -- to illustrate what's taking place and we got really in depth with it. And then they were very satisfied with the -- with the results. But again, we're talking about the phase -- phasing of this development and the triggers that it will take. The first phase that we're going to develop, we can have 145 trips as it sits today. With the access that we have out there today, we can have 145 trips during the -- during the peak hour. And that's not very much. As Mr. -- Mr. Zenner indicated, we can't have more than permit -- we can't permit more than three lots. Well, in reality, it's probably going to be two lots. And so the first phase before we get anything, we have to -- we have to complete the pedestrian crossing at Providence and Veterans United. And so the -- that intersection has three legs that is suited already for pedestrian crossings, they just don't have the fourth leg. And so my client will -- will address that and complete the pedestrian crossing on the fourth leg, which is the south section. On top of that we will have an internal sidewalk connection from the exterior sidewalk network that comes interior to the development. And so anybody who is crossing Providence Road doesn't have to go all the way down to our main intersection. They will have a more direct route. That's the first phase. And again, that's going to be -- allow us to permit two or three of the first lots until we get to the second phase. The second phase, as Mr. Zenner indicated, we could develop -- I believe those are the lots that's in the development agreement. We can develop these lots until -- before we can develop these -- excuse me. Before we can develop these, we have to complete the roundabout at the intersection of Veteran's United as -- to where it goes into the main VU campus, and then the hospital. That will provide our main access into this development. As Mr. Zenner indicated, our main access point -- that divided boulevard at that point will turn into right-in, right-out, and the reason for that is to allow for ample stacking at the intersection of Providence and Veterans United. It pulls that intersection away and it creates a more safe intersection for both pedestrians as well as vehicles. The third phase to the south is, as indicated, is going to trigger significant improvements to Providence Road and Corporate Lake Drive. As it sits right now those -- that intersection already has some issues, and so what MoDOT has asked us to look at was doing a three-quarter, taking out that left turn moving on to Providence Road. That's the most dangerous movement. And so we're eliminating both of those. There's a substantial amount of improvement being done there and It's not just for our development. I mean, half of this is for vehicles that will never enter our development or going the opposite direction. But given the fact that those are concerns and problems that exist today, they have asked us to look at that and -- and fix that, if you will. And so that's the third phase. The other portion of this phase, it will also contain a pedestrian crossing at Corporate Lake and Providence Road. And so that's a key component. There is a lot of residences that you can see, the multi-family that's further to the west. There's sidewalks that lead to

Providence Road, and then, consequently, this would be an access that crosses Providence at that location. There will be a safe haven island in the middle of Providence there for the pedestrians. So that's the phase three. So again, the location is that intersection of expressway and a major collector. The City has noted that as an appropriate location for a nodal commercial. It's walking distance from two major employers and an open high school campus. We've covered these items. It's compliant with the UDC and support staff and so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this -- Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. Is there any discussion about the speed limit on Providence? I think as it heads south is 45 miles per hour.

MR. CROCKETT: I believe that's right.

MS. BURNS: Were there any considerations on speed limit? Is that appropriate? I mean, when -- the traffic study, did you -- that's going pretty fast when you're creating additional --

MR. CROCKETT: It is.

MS. BURNS: -- pedestrian --

MR. CROCKETT: It is. Well, the -- we didn't discuss that because the main pedestrian crossing is going to be at the signalized intersection, and so the idea there is is it an already controlled intersection, so it's already going to slow down. Having that three-quarter, that's the reason why they kind of want that safe haven island in the South Hampton crossing is so that you're only crossing half the street at a time. MoDOT would look at that. I think what they're going to look until there is additional improvements in this location, I think that they're satisfied with the speed limit as it is. That is MoDOT controlled, and really the developer nor the City have much influence over MoDOT at that location.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Can you show me the placement of the roundabout again?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am. It's right there up to the north portion. So going -- obviously, the two -- the east and west leg is Veterans United. The south leg is the entrance coming into Veterans United, and then the north leg going up is the main entrance into the MU Health Clinic.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any other members of the public that are here to speak on this case tonight? Seeing none. I will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comment? Any comments from my fellow Commissioner? We've got a little bit of time to kill. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I'll kill some of it with a motion. How about that?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

MR. MACMANN: In the matter of -- this is 95. Right?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, sir.

MS. BURNS: Ninety-five. Here it is.

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Zenner is shaking his head. I was flipping them before. In the matter of Case 95-2023, Spring Book -- Spring Brook subdivision preliminary plat, I move to approve.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We have a motion by Commissioner MacMann to approve and a second by Commissioner Loe. We will delay roll call until Commissioner Stanton has rejoined us. He stepped out briefly. Is there any discussion on the motion while we wait?

MR. MACMANN: I have a comment.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Love to hear it.

MR. MACMANN: I appreciate -- and this is for Mr. Crockett. I appreciate the blowups on the intersections. I thought that was kind of a nice -- I mean, I know they are mostly just hand renderings, but that helps us see where a plat or a print would not.

MS. CARROLL: I also appreciated that. And going back to it, it was kind of hard to orient on the plat for me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner Carroll. We have a motion pending to approve, and it has been seconded. Seeing as we are all returned to the room, Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval). Voting Yes: Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

Case # 114-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Richland Olivet Farm, LLC, Charlotte Frazier, and Melissa Ussery (owners), seeks approval of 97.02 acres of R-1 (One-Family Residential) and 6.71 acres of M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) zoning as permanent City zoning, pending annexation. The subject 103.73-acre property is located southwest of the intersection of Richland and Olivet Roads and is commonly addressed as 6800 Richland Road. A concurrent request (Case # 113-2023) seeking approval of a 161-lot preliminary plat is also being considered for this acreage.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

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

recommends approval of the Richland Estates preliminary plat

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any Commissioners have had any contact with parties to this case outside of these public hearings, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a question for you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please.

MR. MACMANN: Do you think it would be appropriate to discuss stormwater and stream buffer issues now or at the preliminary plat?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Preliminary plat.

MR. MACMANN: That's what I was thinking too. Thank you for clarifying that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for staff relating to zoning? Seeing none. We'll go to public comment. Please come forward.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, I'll reserve my presentation for the preliminary plat. I believe Mr. Palmer did a thorough job discussing the zoning application for this site. I would note that while it is about 6.7 acres of neighborhood commercial at that corner, really the net acreage is significantly less than that. It's about 4.5 or so. And the reason for that is the realignment. And if you recall several months ago, we came in with a request for Silver Lakes, which is the development immediately to the north, and Olivette doesn't line up or it won't line up. So the idea there is we have to curve Olivette over, and there's going to be a future roundabout at that location in the future. So when you look at 6.7 acres, that might -- well, that's quite a bit just on that one corner, but roughly two acres of that is going to be chewed up just in right-of-way alone for the realignment of Olivette. So I just want to kind of mention that for your consideration. Happy to answer any questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other members of the public to speak on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments relating to the zoning action?
Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: I would like to make a motion if we don't have any additional comments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please.

MS. BURNS: Case number 114-2023, 6800 Richland Road permanent zoning, I recommend approval of the requested zoning.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval has been moved by Commissioner Burns and seconded by Commissioner MacMann. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner

Carroll, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval). Voting Yes: Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

Case # 113-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Richland Olivet Farm, LLC, Charlotte Frazier, and Melissa Ussery (owners), seeking approval of a preliminary plat of a 103.73-acre tract of land to be known as "Richland Estates", subject to annexation and permanent zoning. The proposed development would contain 146 residential lots, 1 neighborhood commercial lot, and 14 common lots. The acreage is located at the southwest corner of Richland and Olivet Roads and is common addressed as 6800 Richland Road. A concurrent request (Case # 114-2023) seeks approval of R-1 (One-family Dwelling) and M-N (Mixed-use Neighborhood) zoning as the acreage's permanent City zoning, upon annexation.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the Richland Estates preliminary plat.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with parties outside of these public hearings, please say so now. Any questions for staff? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Palmer, can I draw your attention to the southern part of the plat near common area 12 and 140, 141, 135?

MR. PALMER: Yes, sir.

MR. MACMANN: Can you blow -- you can't blow that up, can you?

MR. PALMER: No.

MR. MACMANN: We really need to -- where's Brian? We need to get Brian in here to fix that.

MR. ZENNER: I can take it out of the -- I can take it out of the PowerPoint and do that, but --

MR. MACMANN: That's all right. In looking --

MR. PALMER: That's a little -- that's a little bit bigger.

MR. ZENNER: Is that better for you, Mr. MacMann?

MS. GEUEA JONES: We all also have it in front of us if we wanted to --

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. We do. But it's sometimes hard for someone else to -- well, we have folks watching on tv.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: And Council will look at this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Come on.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you for your input. I almost became like Mr. Palmer there and forgot what I was talking about. What I want to talk about is sewers because that's the kind of guy I am. And -- but first, I want you to talk to me about a type two stream buffer. Could you -- one of you gentlemen please give us a sentence or two about type two stream buffers?

MR. PALMER: It's just a regulatory requirement of a type two stream. And I believe it is a total of 100 feet wide. Is that right?

MR. ZENNER: Correct.

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: And it may have, due to slopes, it may increase, actually.

MR. PALMER: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: So they're -- I mean, that's a regulated buffer which has to be preserved. That would be part of the stormwater management plans that are submitted with future development.

MR. MACMANN: With that in mind, thank you for that answer. That is also for future generations. If we turn our attention to lot number 140, which we can blow up and you guys can blow up, I'm a little concerned about construction runoff, et cetera, from lot 140 as it pitches into the type two stream buffer. Is that a concern for you all also or is that just me?

MR. PALMER: So they will submit with their land disturbance permit a packet -- an erosion control plan that will have to take that into consideration. There's any number of measures that will potentially be used there to kind of mitigate that, but --

MR. MACMANN: And I appreciate that and I trust Mr. Crockett. He is nodding his head yes. I'm just -- whenever we have this kind of situation, we're -- we're at the edge of we have to be super careful when we get down there. That's -- that's what I'm saying, and I wanted to get that on the record because that -- that lot in particular is problematic, but I can see that's a future sanitary sewer line that's plotted -- platted in there.

MR. PALMER: I think it exists. Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: You think it exists currently?

MR. PALMER: I --

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Crockett is again shaking his head. And I just have one more question. The rest I can ask of Mr. Crockett. We have the common lot 12 has two functions, the stream buffer and the waste -- and the stormwater retention. Is it typical to do two functions in one common lot or is that --

MR. PALMER: Yeah. It -- it -- I mean, you could divide it into two lots, but it -- it --

MR. MACMANN: We've seen them before side to side and they are divided. And I just wondered if we were i's and t's, p's and q's on this. That's a --

MR. PALMER: Yeah. It's --

MR. MACMANN: That's a Mr. Zenner question. I know that. He's nodding -- he's nodding his

head yes also. So that common lot is fine, though it has two different purposes?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. We have developments that the common lot is any open space between the private lots that kind of gets pretty --

MR. MACMANN: Well, this has two ongoing functions.

MR. ZENNER: Distinct purposes.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. Yeah. Two distinct purposes. And, you know, one is a -- you know, they may not always conjoin. I thank you gentlemen for helping me get that on that record, and may you have a pleasant evening. Madam Chair, I am now done.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. Public comment. Be as brief as you would like.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I'll slow it down for you, Mr. MacMann. I will forego my presentation given the fact that Mr. Palmer covered many of the items, and I would just be duplicating that. I would like to cover a couple of items though. The large lots that he indicated that are shown, basically, that is the -- the area between Oak Mill Subdivision that is a County subdivision to our east and Old Hawthorn North to our west. So basically it is comparable to both of those sides. And then, of course, the commercial lot, I just wanted to just kind of briefly comment on that. There is neighborhood commercial there. There is the realignment of Olivette, but we're not going to have access to -- from that commercial lot directly to Olivette, and certainly not to -- to Richland. It's just too close to that feature roundabout, too close to that intersection. So all of the access will be coming from the south off of Grimshaw. And so that just helps out with that and minimizes the points of connection directly on to those major roadways, given that Olivette is a major -- or excuse me -- a minor arterial. And then, of course, there is the Development Agreement that goes with this, so this development like Silver Lake to the north, Old Hawthorn to the -- to the west will be paying contributions for offsite improvements to the roundabout down at Richland -- Richland Road. So it's going to be comparable to the other two subdivisions. And so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have two sets of questions. You have two sets of properties. Do you have approximate price points for these different sized lots?

MR. CROCKETT: Right now, the price point for lots changes every day, Mr. MacMann. I mean, I would love to tell you what I think they are going to be, but I don't know what the price of concrete is going to be.

MR. MACMANN: I -- I appreciate that. I truly do.

MR. CROCKETT: I mean, I would love to come here and tell you what we think they are going to be, but I would just be speculating at this point. I don't know.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I just wondered if you had one. The second question, if we could turn our gaze to lot number 140 --

MR. CROCKETT: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: -- that has the polar (ph.), if you will, in it.

MR. CROCKETT: Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: That presents me with some concern, and I know we have processes in place --

MR. CROCKETT: Uh-huh. Sure.

MR. MACMANN: -- to do that --

MR. CROCKETT: So -- so let's --

MR. MACMANN: But the buildable -- I think the buildable area, that looks like it's on the west side and it's not very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, if you look at that though, that -- that's -- that draw will be graded out and be pushed over. And the reason for that is when -- let's go back to your comment about the type two stream buffer.

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MR. CROCKETT: We have a type one, two and three. And a type two is an intermittent blue line, which is what we have here. A type three is anything that is not an intermittent blue line, but has a range area of over 50 acres, which that does not. So when you grade this site and you put your road infrastructure in, you are basically cutting off the upper portion of that watershed and it is going to hit the road and it's going to go into your closed conduit system. So the amount of drainage coming through lot 140 is greatly reduced with the development of this piece of property. And so that draw will be pushed over and filled in and then kind of slid to the rear of 140. And so we don't have any -- I don't have any concerns that we can certainly do that, make sure there is no water in the basement, and make sure we can handle that stormwater appropriately.

MR. MACMANN: That's actually why I'm getting -- I'm just getting this on the record.

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MR. MACMANN: If we do it right, it is fine.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. Absolutely.

MR. MACMANN: But every two weeks I deal with this issue --

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MR. MACMANN: -- where it is not -- the grading wasn't sufficient, the compaction wasn't sufficient, something along those lines. And the house is breaking.

MR. CROCKETT: Right.

MR. MACMANN: And -- and we're discharging stuff into a stream when it --

MR. CROCKETT: Well, and just to -- to help solidify that a little bit, Mr. MacMann, on all of our

subdivisions, we have third-party testing. We do that ourself. So we're out there checking the compaction in six-inch lifts for the contractor as they raise these building pads up. When we come in for a building permit through BSD, when they look at a fill section, they are going to want those foundations to go to native material or provide those -- those compaction calculate -- testing results.

MR. MACMANN: I just want to avoid the situation we had with -- I don't remember what the name was and I won't say it here. The student housing complex that is sliding down the hill --

MR. CROCKETT: Right.

MR. MACMANN: -- that's another one of the issues I want to address. Thank you, Madam Chair for indulging me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner. Any other questions for this speaker? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Just a short one. I had a question about did I hear correctly that Burghley is slated to become a major arterial --

MR. CROCKETT: I believe -- I believe it is a neighborhood collector. Is that --

MS. PLACIER: A neighborhood --

MR. CROCKETT: Or is that a major collector?

MR. PALMER: I think it is a major collector.

MR. CROCKETT: A major collector.

MS. PLACIER: A major collector. Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. So there is no driveways off of it, ma'am.

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. There's just that funny little Burghley Circle. It's not driveways, but it adds a couple of extra intersections.

MR. CROCKETT: Correct. There is a piece of property down there that we wanted to utilize, and so in doing this -- we've done this before. If you recall the Silver Lakes development to the north, that Burghley Drive continues on through that development, and I believe we had a couple of those in that development as well, and so it is kind of a way that we can put -- get access. But the important part there by doing that, vehicles aren't backing on to that street. They are pulling on to it rather than backing on to it.

MS. PLACIER: Right. Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case from the members of the public? Seeing none. I'll close public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If we have no other comments or concerns, I have a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry. One moment.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: I have one comment. I just want to say we've had a couple subdivisions coming through that have asked for exceptions to go beyond our maximum street length, and this one it looked like it was coming in really close or it wasn't exceeding it. And I appreciated having a neighborhood layout that looked like it was more conducive to some of the networking and internal multi-modal that we have been striving for. So I just wanted to thank you for that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner Loe. Gold star or at least a silver one. Commissioner MacMann, I believe we are now ready for you.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you. It will be a nice amenity. I have a motion. In the matter of Case 113-2023, Richland Estates preliminary plat, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval has been moved by Commissioner MacMann and seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval). Voting Yes: Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: We have eight votes to approve; the motion is carried.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Okay. We've got two left. I thought we could get done by 10:30. Let's see how fast we can do these.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 142-2023

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Sonya Andreassen-Henderson (owner), seeking to rezone 10.53-acres from R-1 (Single-family Dwelling) to A (Agriculture). The subject 10.53 acres is located at the western terminus of Westwinds Drive north of the Stadium Boulevard and is commonly addressed as 1605 & 1607 Westwinds Drive. A concurrent request (Case # 144-2023) seeks conditional use permit (CUP) approval to allow the applicant to construct a second principal dwelling on the property, subject to approval of this request. The existing single-family dwelling occupying the site is addressed 1605 Westwinds Drive.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning of the subject 10.53-acres to A (Agriculture)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Before we go to questions of staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had any contact with any parties outside of this public hearing, please let us know now. Seeing none. Any questions for staff? Seeing none. I will open the floor to public comment. Please come forward.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. GEBHARDT: Jay Gebhardt, civil engineer, A Civil Group. You guys got any questions?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much for being here tonight.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments. Any comments on the case? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: I do live in this neighborhood, and one asset that I don't think the report quite included is that -- and I think this is a very appropriate one to include on Commissioner Burns last meeting. She will appreciate this. This parcel is adjacent to the County House Trail, which along with the utility easements that runs up the County House ravine and the park -- Kiwanis Park, make up a bit of a wildlife corridor through this area. So having another open parcel, it's sort of a string of pearls, so to speak. And I think the City should actually be cognizant of how they are putting together or locating open parcels so that we do maintain these wildlife corridors through the city. So I think this is a good addition to that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other comments?

MS. BURNS: I'm supportive --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: -- of wildlife corridors. So, thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: As this is Commissioner Burns' final appearance, I think you should make this motion.

MS. BURNS: Well, there is one more after this.

MR. MACMANN: It's the same thing.

MS. BURNS: By all means. In the matter of Case 142-2023, 1605 Westwinds Drive rezoning, I recommend approval of the requested rezoning to the A district.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval has been moved by Commissioner Burns and seconded by Commissioner MacMann. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we please have a roll call.

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

carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: We have eight votes to approve; the motion is carried.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

Moving on to our last case of the evening.

Case # 144-2023

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Sonya Andreassen-Henderson (owner), for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a second principal dwelling to be constructed on property addressed as 1605 & 1607 Westwinds Drive subject to approval of a concurrent request to rezone the 10.53-acre tract from R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) to A (Agriculture) as presented in Case # 142-2023. If the CUP and rezoning are approved, a second single-family dwelling would be allowed on the subject acreage in addition to the existing home addressed as 1605 Westwinds Drive. The 10.53-acre subject site is located at western terminus of Westwinds Drive, north of Stadium Boulevard and is commonly addressed as 1605 & 1607 Westwinds Drive.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested conditional use permit allowing a second principal residence to be constructed on the 10.53-acre parcel with said residence being addressed 1607 Westwinds Drive subject to rezoning of the acreage to A (Agriculture) as presented in Case # 142-2023.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff has anyone had any contact with any of the parties in this case? No. Okay. Thank you. Questions for staff? Seeing none. Public comment?

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. GEBHARDT: Jay Gebhardt, A Civil Group, 3401 Broadway Business Park. I'm here to answer questions. I -- I do want to say a little bit. This has been a process that we started for the Henderson's over a year ago, and she had a real simple request. She just wanted to build a home. And so, I don't want to muddy this discussion with any of that, but she sure would appreciate a positive vote on this tonight and be able to come back home and build a home on her family's property.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker?

MS. WILSON: No questions. But thank you for hanging in there.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner Wilson. Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comment? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Two things before I pass this ball. Number one, every time I see this property, I think of the Busch property in downtown St. Louis, because there is a castle in downtown St. Louis. And secondly, I would like to make a motion, but this is the last opportunity for Commissioner

Burns --

MS. BURNS: No. You go ahead but thank you.

MR. MACMANN: In the name of Commissioner Burns as it refers to Case 142-2023, 1605

Westwinds Drive rezoning and CUP --

MR. ZENNER: I'm sorry. You --

MR. MACMANN: I move to approve.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Just the CUP.

MR. ZENNER: It's the CUP only.

MR. MACMANN: Just the CUP. Just the CUP. Correction. I move to approve.

MS. BURNS: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I've got a motion for approval by Commissioner MacMann and a second by Commissioner Burns in deference to this being her last case. Is there any discussion on the motion? One question for legal. Did we get in that motion the substantial compliance with the exhibit? And maybe that's for the transcriptionist.

MS. THOMPSON: I don't believe that was made a part of the motion, but you can make the motion --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MS. THOMPSON: -- to amend the motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I would move to amend the motion.

MR. MACMANN: I would gladly entertain and accept that amendment.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. That amendment --

MR. MACMANN: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: The motion maker and second have agreed to my amendment to include the word substantial compliance with submitted application exhibit to the previous motion. I get a nod from legal. Excellent. In that case any discussion on the motion as amended? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval). Voting Yes: Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any comment from the public tonight? Seeing -- oh, please come forward.

MR. GEBHARDT: Jay Gebhardt, A Civil Group. I just want to say thank you all for the service

that you guys do, but especially Tootie. I'll miss you up there.

MS. BURNS: I appreciate it.

MR. GEBHARDT: I appreciate all your all's input and to try to make things better for everyone.

So thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Anyone else? If not, we'll go to staff comments.

X. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. ZENNER: So you will notice that there is not a meeting shown for May 18th. I was informed early this afternoon that the single subdivision case that we were going to have on this agenda is going to need to be delayed. There has been a delay in being able to complete some surveying that we need, so we will not have a regular meeting on May 18th. You, however, will have a work session on May 18th, and the reason for that work session is not to discuss this evening's topic of short term rental survey results, is not to discuss resort -- or residential cottage standards. It is to discuss -- and I may not be in attendance at this meeting. I may need to be out of town. Ms. Thompson will be providing the overview of necessary regulatory changes to accommodate marijuana micro business within our zoning code. So this is going to be a similar exercise to what we had to do when comprehensive marijuana facilities were brought online. The State has decided to change the time frame that was originally identified in the statutory language, which they were allowed to do. And they are ready to issue licensures for marijuana micro businesses sooner than what was anticipated. In order to ensure that our regulations are properly positioned for that, we will need to give you an overview of the legislation that will be being presented at the June 8 meeting. So this is going to be a scenario where we are having to unfortunately or fortunately for some fast track the ordinance amendments through the process. It is further compounded by the fact that the Council has cancelled its July 3rd meeting, and the date of receiving applications, if I recall correctly from the communications that we have had, begins on July 17, which is the date of the second meeting in July for Council.

MS. THOMPSON: July 27th.

MR. ZENNER: Twenty-seventh. So we do get some extra time given that it is July 27, ten days, but we have to move the project through because we are losing a meeting. My scheduled vacation is June 8. I will not be here, so it will be probably Ms. Thompson giving the staff report as it relates to this. I am taking a well needed three-week vacation, and will be back hopefully refreshed. So you do have items, however, that will be on the June 8th agenda. My competent colleagues will be here to present them to you. We will have the platting action that would have been on the May 18th meeting, and that is at 4206 I-70 Drive Southeast. This is a final plat. It needs some surveying work in order to verify particular elements of the plan, and they've just been having a difficult time getting the survey crew out there to do that. It is not anything that is overly technical, but it's just time consuming. And then there are three other public hearing requests. So don't worry, we won't have a marathon session again. The Corona Road request which we tabled this evening, depending on how the applicant responds to

request -- our requested comments, this may or may not appear on the June 8 agenda. It is possible that depending on how the response comes back, it may be classified as a minor amendment, and we may be able to administratively deal with that. But at this point it is tentatively scheduled for your June 8th meeting. We have Case 157-2023, One Sexton. This is the Kinney Point project for CHA. And what this is involving is -- this is the intersection of Sexton and Garth. This is involving the expansion of the PD Plan to incorporate property that was formerly occupied by City of Refuge on Grand Avenue. And so what is being proposed here is the addition of ten additional units, two-unit buildings to be added to the northeast corner of the property in addition to the existing dwelling -- existing units that they have on the property, and it does require going back through an entire plan approval given that we are adding the acreage in. It also will require reapproval of existing design adjustments that were granted because through the reapproval process those are voided, and there are several design exceptions that are being asked for. Mr. Palmer, who handled the first -- the most current revision on this is also handling this case for continuity. And then, finally, 159-2023 are the changes for marijuana micro businesses. It is going to be a very simple ordinance and a very simple set of text changes. Definitions -- we're incorporating and changing some of the use specific standards to ensure that there is continuity with the legislation. We are not creating any -- at this point no additional application procedures beyond what our current specific standards are, so that means they will still have to be 500 feet away from any protected use -- school, church or daycare, and then meet all of the other requirements that currently exists. We just need to incorporate by definition and then in the land use table the uses to ensure that if we are asked to generate zoning verification letters as part of the application process, we can do so legally, and the uses are legally allowed. The details of what the -- of how this will all play out; I will let Ms. Thompson take care of at your next meeting. Here are your maps for your cases. The three that we have maps for. The I-70 Drive property, our property off of Corona, and then our East Sexton property. It is with great pleasure and somewhat of a little bit of sadness to see Ms. Burns off of our Commission. It has been a wonderful opportunity for myself over the years that you have been here to have the opportunity to work with you, and you have been instrumental in a number of the topics that we have taken. We are also going to be losing Ms. Kimbell. She did not reapply. And as Ms. Carroll has asked me, are they having interviews? We do not know. I can't give you that answer. I do know that I have been told that Ms. Carroll will serve until a replacement is found and the replacements would be being sworn in at the beginning of June.

MS. CARROLL: I'm reapplying.

MR. ZENNER: I know you are.

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: And so if you are not reappointed, you will serve.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

MR. ZENNER: But we are -- we are currently obviously -- you know, we are waiting for Council

action and new members. We had four applicants that applied, so we will find out how that plays out, if it was not readvertised and they got more. We also currently -- just to give you a status update as it relates to several projects that we are working on, the central city project that is dealing with the consultant, we are still finalizing consultant terms with the -- with our consultant -- the potential consultant. We have not released the RFP for the Comprehensive Plan nor have we released an RFP for the Transportation Plan at this point, but the Transportation Plan will be being released. Given the staffing levels which we are advertising for to fill the vacancies, we are not going to add additional work to the -- the current setup that we have, so we will be requesting that the carryover for the funds allocated for the comp plan go into fiscal '24. We hope that we may be able to release that RFP later this year, but I want to wait to make sure that we have adequate staffing to do so. We've got a lot of other work to cover, so adding a comp plan on top of everything else may be a little bit more than you all want to bite off. That's all I have to offer. Thank you very much for your attention and we will hopefully not do another 12 agenda -- item agenda in a while.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Zenner.

XI. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would -- though it is late, we cannot let Commissioner Burns go without being thanked and loved. Commissioner MacMann?

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would any of my fellow Commissioners like to have -- say a few words?

MS. PLACIER: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: I just wanted to say that I really appreciated your comments throughout this time that I've worked with you, but also especially during the work session, telling us to have -- to get a backbone or whatever you said, you know,

MS. BURNS: This was my last -- my last meeting, Peggy. I had to kind of -- you know.

MS. PLACIER: Well, I'm going to carry that forward.

MS. BURNS: Well, that makes me feel good. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I have a new friend -- well, not new anymore because we have been buddies for a long time, but I'm glad we got to meet each other, and you and Dr. Burns, I consider good friends.

MS. BURNS: Right back at you. And I know we will be seeing more of you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: We will miss you. I will miss you. We've been through quite a bit together into many early mornings and it's been -- it's been quite enjoyable. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: You've got to share with everybody about your artwork.

MS. BURNS: Oh, thank you, Shannon. Yes. I just got word today that I have a piece that is going to be shown in the Daum Contemporary Art Museum in Sedalia.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Wow.

MS. BURNS: It's kind of my first -- yeah. So it was a good day.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Cool.

MS. BURNS: I'm really thrilled about that. Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: Tootie, what -- what is that?

MS. BURNS: It's a -- the Daum.

MR. MACMANN: No. I know what it is, but when is it happening?

MS. BURNS: Yeah. I take it up there later in May, and then the show is through August. I will send Pat information as well as a photo of the piece so you all can go and look for it.

MR. MACMANN: I have a special request.

MS. BURNS: Yes?

MR. MACMANN: Because this -- (inaudible).

MS. BURNS: Yes?

MR. MACMANN: Take a picture.

MS. BURNS: Of the floor?

MR. MACMANN: The floor.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner is asking her to take a picture --

MS. BURNS: I'll take a picture of the floor --

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- of the floor --

MS. BURNS: -- in the Daum.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- in the Daum --

MR. MACMANN: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- Art Museum.

MR. MACMANN: I'm sorry. Yes. I have a Commissioner who -- excuse me. I have a customer who wants that floor.

MS. BURNS: Okay. I'll see what I can do.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else. Well, thank you very much, Commissioner Burns, and then I'll let you say your goodbye.

MS. BURNS: I just -- quickly, I think this -- thank you all so much for those kind words and for the many hours we have spent together. We have been through it. I appreciate your service, and -- and your candid thoughts, and the work that everybody on this Commission does. And Janna, and Becky, and Pat, and all the staff, thank you. It's been so nice to get to meet all of you. And so I'll miss seeing you on Thursday night, kind of. And it was just a complete meeting tonight because both wildlife corridors and steep slopes were mentioned --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MS. BURNS: -- as they were at my first meeting, and I thought, oh my gosh, what are they talking about.

MS. LOE: Okay. I'm going to mention truncated corners, just to get them all in there.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We also have truncated. Well, thank you very much, Commissioner Burns, and thank you for always being the one who keeps us accountable and on track.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We appreciate you and you will be sorely missed.

MS. BURNS: I appreciate it. Thank you all very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. If no one else has any comments?

XII. ADJOURNMENT

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a piece of information to answer Commissioner Carroll's question with a piece of noninformation. Two Council members said they want to do interviews; however, if you look at their schedule, they don't have any time. I'm just passing that along. With that I move to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Adjournment moved by Commissioner MacMann and seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Seeing no objections, we are adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.)

(Off the record.)