

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
March 7, 2024

Case Number 31-2024

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of TKG Storage Mart Partners Portfolio, LLC (owners) seeking approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a self-service storage facility over 14-feet in height, located at 3412 I-70 Drive SE. (This request was tabled at the December 21,2023 and January 18, 2024 Planning Commission meetings to permit revisions to the request in regards to the Design Standards and Guidelines of Section 29-4.6(c) and the Use-specific Standards of Section 29-3.3(w) of the UDC.)

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested conditional use permit for the construction of a self-service storage facility greater than 14 feet in height on the property addressed 3412 I-70 Drive SE.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there questions for staff? If no one else has one, I just have a clarification. So the building material exception, is that also a matter for BOA, or does approval tonight approve that exception?

MR. PALMER: So that will be -- that is for your consideration to the extent that it would be a condition of your approval. So if what they're showing is -- is adequate to you, a straight up approval is probably okay, but if you're not satisfied with that and you see fit to add a condition of some further articulation or, you know, whatever you would see fit, that can be added as a condition of your approval.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But the 29-4.6(c) are BOA matters?

MR. PALMER: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. PALMER: And the -- the -- I'm trying to think back. So that component is a part of the section that allows you the authority to kind of add those conditions, and so that's kind of where we're at now is --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: In the contextual -- it's the contextual based exception.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right.

MR. ZENNER: If you feel that it's not necessary, you have the authority to waive the -- the

general compliance requirements for architectural standards.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick. The building 100 by 55-ish?

MR. PALMER: I believe. There -- go all the way back. No, it's not.

MR. MACMANN: I'll ask Mr. Crockett when he comes up. I just didn't see it.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. I think -- I think it's around 100 square. Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: It's not jumping out at me. And one last question. What are lighting standards in this situation?]

MR. PALMER: Just whatever the standard for M-C is. I don't know off the top of my head, but it would be similar --

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Zenner --

MR. PALMER: -- to the rest of it.

MR. MACMANN: -- do you know what the standard for M-C is, how tall they can be?

MR. ZENNER: I believe the maximum light standard size is 28 feet. It would be 21 near adjoining residential.

MR. MACMANN: Residential.

MR. ZENNER: So this is going to be in a commercial setting similar to probably what will be --

MR. MACMANN: I was looking around -- it's all -- mostly M-OF around if I'm --

MR. ZENNER: The hotel being M-C and then the Moser's, which would be to the west will be the M-C. M-OF is to the south, so I think we're going to meet the standard requirements inward, downward, and would have the foot candle limitations off property.

MR. MACMANN: The only ones I would be concerned about are the ones, I guess, facing, like, towards the hotel. I wouldn't want that room. All right. Thank you, staff, very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We'll open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward. Name and address for the record. Three minutes if you're an individual, six minutes if you are here for a group, including the applicant.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. Mr. MacMann, to answer your question to start off, the building is about 100 by 110 is the rough size -- a footprint of the building just to start off with that. So I think Mr. Palmer did a very thorough and good staff report, so I'm going to just kind of quickly skim some of my slides here tonight. I think the overview, I think you did a job. You know, you're pretty familiar with what we're asking for tonight. Again, a conditional use for this specific use. One thing to note is the maximum building height in M-C is 45 feet. What we're asking for here, our building, it is a walk-out as Mr. -- Mr. Palmer indicated. On the high side or the higher side of the parking lot, it's only about 23 feet in height, and on the backside it's 33 feet, so we're not even coming close to that 44 -- or excuse me -- that 45-foot height.

We're much less than that in an area that has quite a few taller buildings. We've got the three-story hotel, we've got a six- or seven-story hotel, and some other larger buildings out there, as well. So, you know, you kind of see the location here. Here's the zoning map. Obviously, we're not adjacent to any residential zoning, so we feel, you know, very -- you know, protected by that. Mr. Palmer indicated that we won't see the building from the adjacent right-of-way, and he had a schematic that kind of showed where the location of the building would be, but his schematic kind of showed that on the front side of the trees. There is a tree line between us and I-70 there. So here's our location. You can see that the building itself is going to be shielded, for the most part, by -- from the hotel. The hotel is going to screen us from adjacent right-of-ways. Yes, it is adjacent to the hotel itself. The larger grocer to the west is there and, of course, our existing facility further east. Scanning out just a little bit, you can see all the other commercial developments in the area, so we feel that it's in character with what's already out there. Again, you've seen these depictions. Again, it walks out from one side to the other, from 23 to 33 feet in height. Another depiction there. The green arrow points to where our building is going to be located, so you can see that it's behind the hotel, screened from view. Here's the -- on Keene Street. It's -- again, you can see it's screened. We've got trees that will give it some buffer, as well as the existing buildings. Use specific standards, I think Mr. Palmer went through all those. I'm happy to answer any questions with regards to those. I believe we are in conformance with those. This project has been tabled several times. It started back in December, the first time it had come before this Commission in December; however, it was tabled for the purpose of going back and making revisions and working with City staff to come up with a plan that had those different building materials in the locations that might be visible from the public view, and so that was the reason for the tabling. We have been working with staff for some time now to get those standards -- get those revisions made so we can be in conformance with those standards. So again, you know, we believe it's consistent with the allowed uses with existing zoning. It's consistent with the specified use standards, promotes an increase in density around an already existing infrastructure, the infrastructure is there for it. It's compatible and it comes to you with support from City staff. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. I have a quick question. So you're putting tiny bits of brick on here, but the rest of it is still sheet metal?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. That's basically the plan, yes, ma'am. Because it doesn't have any, really, view from any -- any adjacent areas. It's kind of secluded back in the back corner of the existing site. The metal is going to match the existing facility, the materials on the existing --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. I've seen the existing facility.

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And how does that put you in compliance?

MR. CROCKETT: When we -- talking with City staff, what is it's -- the intent is so that it is an aesthetic, pleasing building from the point of view from where you can see it from the -- from public rights-of-way. And so those locations and where it's visible from public rights-of-way, those are the locations in

which on that back corner is where we have put the brick material.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But that's not what it says. It says the -- the exterior shall be constructed entirely of --

MR. CROCKETT: We understand that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. And you said you were -- you made changes to put in compliance with the USS -- you did not do that.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. We have made changes working with City staff to make changes to the proposal that's before you tonight. I may have misled you, and I apologize for that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That -- right. I just wanted to make it clear that you're not -- you're still asking for that exception.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. I apologize if I'm -- if something is misunderstood, I apologize.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sure what you meant was you were in compliance with what the staff asked you to do.

MR. CROCKETT: We worked together to come up with a plan that's -- yes, not compliance entirely with the regulation, and this is what's before you tonight. Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Anyone else from the public to speak on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

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

MR. MACMANN: This is -- as this is a CUP, and if we agree that the exterior plan as presented is sufficient, I think it is in everyone's interest if we would include that in our motion. I mean, I've got the impression from you, Mr. Palmer, and if I got that wrong that we didn't need to, but I think we need to.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. That's up to you.

MR. MACMANN: All right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I would agree with that. Any other Commissioner comments? I will say just as -- for me, if this were not three stories tall, I might be okay with allowing it to be 90 percent galvanized metal siding. As it is, I've seen how that stuff wears. I've seen how it looks on their existing facilities. I've seen it in other places. And even if it is behind a hotel, it, to me, goes against the use specific standards that we've created for this CUP, and I -- I don't think I can vote for that exception. I'm fine with the height, I'm just not fine with the exterior. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Pursuant of that line of reasoning, how would I bring that up? As an amendment? We discuss that separately and up and down, and then we've got to put it with the rest of it?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, I don't think you even need to do that. We can up and down the whole thing. I could be the only person voting no, if I'm the only person --

MR. MACMANN: Well, I don't know what --

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- if I'm the only person that feels that way.

MR. MACMANN: -- everyone else thinks, that's why.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, I don't, either. Commissioner Carroll, did I see your hand?

MS. CARROLL: No. I was having technical difficulties.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. No. Okay. Any other comment? Commissioner Dunn?

MR. DUNN: I will just say I think it is a little telling that, like, the hotel didn't come to testify in regards to the siding and everything else. You would think that they might have some strong opinions about the appearance of a storage facility right next to them. If they had genuine concerns, I would imagine they would be here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's fair. Anyone else? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I would like to entertain a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 31-2024, 3412 I-70 Drive SE, conditional use permit, I move to approve the CUP permitted -- permitted as self-service storage facility over 14 feet in height.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: A motion was made by Commissioner Stanton and seconded by Commissioner MacMann. Is there any further 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: Mr. Dunn, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Placier, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton. Voting No: Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Wilson, Motion carries 6-2.

MS. CARROLL: We have six to approve, and two no.

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