

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
November 6, 2025

Case Number 335-2025

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Broad Park LLC (owner), for approval to rezone 73.75-acres of property from PD (Planned Development) to R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) to allow for residential development under an open zoning district. The subject site is located south of the intersection of Timber Road and Green Valley Drive, and includes the address 1 Broadway Village Drive.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the request to rezone the 73.75 acres from PD (Planned Development) to R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling).

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. Questions for staff? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Could you pull up the flood area map that you had?

MR. ORENDORFF: Certainly.

MR. BRODSKY: Yeah. That one. Okay. So -- okay. I see what you're saying, the floodway versus the floodplain overlay. In the ordinance in our floodplain overlay ordinance, it mentions these zones that A zones. Is that going to be associated with the FEMA floodway?

MR. ORENDORFF: The floodway is a separate distinction from our floodplain overlays. It supersedes anything that our floodplain overlays have as far as being a development exclusion zone, if you will.

MR. BRODSKY: Right. I guess what I'm getting at, and I'm -- I just had it here in the ordinances, but there's -- there's a section where it talks about not developing, not doing any fill, maybe permitted within zone AE and the flooded -- flood drainage areas on X or other flood areas. Does that sound familiar? Is that ringing a bell?

MR. ORENDORFF: It sounds roughly familiar, and what I will say is that upon any sort of building permit that is submitted to us, that -- that goes to BSD, they will review it to make sure that it is outside of any sort of true exclusionary zone as far as that is concerned. For the rezoning here, it is something that we definitely wanted to address, and I want to say thank you for bringing this up ahead of time so I can get these maps prepared for you, but in a broad strokes what's highlighted just in blue could be

developed. I would have to triple check what that specific classification is for the floodway, but from my recollection, the hash zone is areas that FEMA doesn't want touched at all.

MR. BRODSKY: I'm just looking at our ordinances here for the benefit of my fellow Commissioners for the floodplain overlay district, and specifically B -- B(3)(e). Until a floodway has been designated, no development, including landfill may be permitted within Zone AE in the flood drainage area. So it seems that it's alluding to these areas that aren't in a floodway yet, but are in these other districts that, you know, there can't be any fill, there can't be any buildings. Commissioner Darr, I don't know if you can weigh in on this a little bit.

MR. DARR: Yeah. I'm not looking at the Code exactly, but AE refers to -- is a FEMA designation on the FEMA floodplain maps, and it generally means it's -- it's a floodplain that has been in a studied river or create or drainage way that has a flood -- that has a floodway. So Zone AE would be a long creek that has a floodway. So Zone X would be on a creek that maybe hadn't been studied by FEMA, and therefore, they can't determine where that floodway, where that, as he called it, a no-go zone, which is a no fill zone, is what would be probably more accurate. You can't put any fill in that area, so you can't put any structures or anything like that. So AE is just referring to the portion of the floodway and a studied floodplain that's outside of the floodway.

MR. BRODSKY: Okay.

MR. DARR: But I don't know -- I'm not looking exactly at what part of the Code you're looking for if that -- with that address is what your actual question was

MR. BRODSKY: And that may be -- Mr. Crockett can shed some light on some of this stuff, too.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Well, I will address that to my fellow Commissioner. So kind to add on what Mr. Darr is talking about, these have been studied floodways and they have designations. The ones that have not been studied cannot be determined way or overlay because they haven't been studied. You could theoretically build in an overlay, but it would be of great expense. You couldn't guarantee insurance. I mean -- you know what I mean, it's like a whole chop your arm off and go talk to the Congress. I mean, from a development point of view, it's not feasible, but it could be possible.

MR. BRODSKY: I think my -- my larger concern is I'm bringing in fill and bringing it out of a floodway, and the effect downstream. And I'm just looking at this ordinance, you know, that says that including fill may not be permitted, but -- so, yeah. I'm sure Mr. Crockett can shed some light in on us.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: Typically, it is not really that uncommon to have development in the floodplain outside of the floodway.

MR. STANTON: Right.

MR. DARR: You just have to get the additional permit. You have to show that you're not filling in a floodway, or you have to, if it is in an unstudied drainage way, then you have to provide a study showing where that theoretical floodway would be perhaps to show that you're not impacting any downstream

existing development. And you have to prove that any structure you build in the floodplain would be above the 100-year floodplain surface elevation. So they would just be looking at your development plan and ensuring that any buildings are at least two foot above the 100-year flood point elevation based on FEMA studies where they have published elevations for those 100-year elevations.

MR. BRODSKY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Can you go back to -- and I know they don't have to stick to it, but can you go back to the slide with the proposed new building?

MR. ORENDORFF: Yeah

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. That's what I thought. It looks to me, without being able to overlay them or put them side by side, that they're talking about building right along the edge outside of even the floodplain, and I know Tim will come up here at some point and probably correct me, but --

MR. ORENDORFF: So what -- what they're illustrating from, you know, me kind of mentally overlaying these together, they are proposing potentially in the floodplain, not the floodway.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. ORENDORFF: And I also want to reiterate that they're not beholding to anything here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Correct.

MR. ORENDORFF: This is just a proof of concept that is being proposed.

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. No. I understand. It just -- it shows us kind of what -- where their brain is at, but -- okay. So these bottom ones -- because the one that's to the northwest -- sorry. Can you go back to the floodplain floodway map?

MR. ORENDORFF: Certainly.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Maybe I'm -- my brain is just making it work because it's a similar shape is what's happening. Okay. Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. Will our first speaker on this case please come forward?

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, offices at 1000 West Nifong. To start off by answering the questions that Mr. Brodsky had, and Mr. Darr is correct on that. We want to make sure that we're not -- we're not confusing floodway with floodplain. Floodplain is an area that we can fill in. There's FEMA regulations, and there's City regulations, there's elevation regulations that -- that we need to abide by. It's commonplace for development to occur in around the floodplain fringes. The floodway is a protected area, absolutely no fill in those structures, no obstructions in the floodway, and so that's the critical area that FEMA has identified that we need to set aside and leave alone. Now in the floodplain, they have provisions for that. They have provisions for us to fill. They have provisions for us to build. Certain -- you know, a lot of instances, we can build even below the floodplain elevation for certain -- not for any inhabitable structures, but other types of structures. So it is certainly something that happens on a routine basis, so that's not out of the ordinary. In this particular instance here, we may be in the floodplain in some locations, but the intent is to try to develop on the -- on the higher areas, certainly. I think as Ian and his

staff has indicated, my clients, they recently bought this property a few years ago. They have no intentions of tearing down buildings. They paid a substantial amount for this property for this investment. It's a great development. Mr. Hagan owned this for a long, long time, took great care in this property. It's about 40 years old, and I challenge to find another multi-family residential development in this community that looks this good that's 40 years old, so those structures are staying where they're at. We just want to be a little more diligent with the development that we're doing. As prices go up, as the city continues to expand, we're looking for places that -- to add development to existing properties. And development practices 40 years ago were different than they are today. We didn't get as dense, we didn't get as tight on a lot of the developments that we do then as we do today. And so what we're trying to do is just to kind of find some places on the property and utilize those areas to increase density slightly. As Kirtis indicated, you know, our -- our current density is about 5.7 units per acre. So in a multi-family residential district, that's what I would consider low density for -- for apartment development. So we're not going to increase it greatly, above that, certainly nowhere remotely close to the 17.4 units that would be allowed in R-MF. We're not looking to upzone or downzone this property. I look at it as a lateral move. With the UDC in 2017, as we all know, several members of this Commission were -- was instrumental in creating that -- that document. We're being encouraged to go with the open districts now. We're being encouraged to develop under those open zoning categories. We have neighborhood protections and we have all these other items in the -- embedded in the UDC that protects everything that a PD plan would -- would protect. And so we see this as a lateral move. It's going to be a lot easier moving forward as we develop, and it takes away the burden portion of coming back each and every time that we want to add a sidewalk, add a small building, add some parking, or anything like that. And so that's the reason for it, and again, just want to reiterate that the residents that are there now, they're not going to be displaced, leases are not going to be terminated, folks aren't going to lose their homes, it's going to stay the same with -- hopefully with the potential of adding in some units. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any -- okay. Great.

MR. CROCKETT: And I would, Madam, if I may -- Madam Chair, if I may --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MR. CROCKETT: -- add one item.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MR. CROCKETT: The stormwater regulations in the city of Columbia, I know we're sitting down here and there is some concerns with -- with, you know, a lot of water and some flooding of the creeks. As this development redevelops, and when I say redevelop, it doesn't mean we have to tear down units to redevelop, we can simply add to the site. That's still classified as redevelopment. The way the stormwater regulations work is that there's redevelopment cycles that take place. And so when I add impervious surface to the area, obviously, we have to do detention and water quality on what we add to it. But the redevelopment -- but the redevelopment portion of it also tells us that we have to go back and

incrementally start addressing detention and water quality for existing impervious surface. So back in 1984, they didn't have to detention. They didn't have to do water quality. But as we redevelop this site, as we add units to it, the regulations require us to go back and start picking off some of those items. So this is going to be one of those instances where really a post-development situation is going to be a lot better than pre-development situation, because we are going to address some of those stormwater concerns as the site redevelops. I just wanted to kind of mention that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Darr, we'll start with you, and go to Commissioner Brodsky.

MR. DARR: He answered exactly what I was going to -- I just wanted you to elaborate on the stormwater. Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: And just to clarify, Mr. Crockett. I'm not opposed to this zoning.

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MR. BRODSKY: My concern was more, you know, seeing the layout of the land --

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. Absolutely. Absolutely.

MR. BRODSKY: -- where are those buildings going to go. And then I found this ordinance in the flood -- oh, the flood overlay. Can you help me understand just what this zone AE and flood drainage area zone X, what that's about?

MR. CROCKETT: Now, originally, I think when the UDC was written, there was verbiage in there that talked about not developing in the floodplain.

MR. BRODSKY: Yes.

MR. CROCKETT: And I think that that was quickly removed or amended, I believe. I would have to go back and ask Mr. Zenner on that portion. But we have recently, you know, done development in the floodplains, and so it's -- it's a -- you know, it's not a practice you do every day, but it's certainly something that's on a routine basis. So there's a lot of regulations that go into it. We're very well versed, as is the City, and the City stormwater engineers, so they know it all very well. So it is -- I'm not sure exactly what you're looking for, looking at there, Mr. Brodsky, but it certainly is allowable in the city of Columbia. Now the floodway is something totally different.

MR. BRODSKY: No. I appreciate that. And, you know, part of this is, you know, I'm not an engineer, I don't do this every day.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. I understand.

MR. BRODSKY: But I -- when I see this ordinance and it says, you know, no development --

MR. CROCKETT: Right.

MR. BRODSKY: -- before it's designated as a floodway, that it had some --

MR. CROCKETT: Right. And if it makes reference to floodway, then that is correct. The floodway, we want to stay out of all together.

MR. BRODSKY: Well, this is referencing areas prior to being designated as a floodway.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. So let's talk about that a little bit with what Mr. Darr had indicated. This is a studied area, so FEMA has come through here and they've studied it and they determined what the base flood elevation is, BFE, you may have heard that term, is a base flood elevation, and they have studied and said on the 100-year event, this will be the elevation -- theoretical elevation of the flood waters. Okay? So they have determined what that is. There are locations especially in the upper one mile of a waterway, they may say, okay, well, this area has not been studied. We're not going to study to the very top of a watershed, we're going to stop at this point. So from here on up, you may encounter floodway, you may encounter floodplain. Those are unstudied areas. And so until those areas are studied, and those are usually done by the applicant, we'll do a, you know, hydraulic model, we'll study, we'll determine what that base flood elevation should be, we'll submit to the City stormwater engineers, and they'll evaluate it and they'll work it out, yes, they agree, no, they don't, but we come to a conclusion. We determine what that base flood elevation is and then we basically go from there. And so, what that's referencing is until those elevations have been determined and that floodway has been determined, then no filling or no construction can take place in that location.

MR. BRODSKY: And that does make sense, because it does reference this upper square mile.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. There you go. Yeah. So that's all -- that's all in an unstudied area.

MR. BRODSKY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? So the floodplain where you are able to build with special permits --

MR. CROCKETT: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- does that cover the areas we are currently contemplating potential new -
- new buildings?

MR. CROCKETT: Some of it, not -- not all of it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: But we -- just a portion of it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: Just, you know, just -- we're trying to keep the buildings out as much as we can. There may be some parking. There may be some buildings, but we have to elevate it. What the requirement of the City of Columbia is, FEMA has said that this is the base flood elevation. The City of Columbia says we have to be two feet above that base flood elevation. Now what you do in that instance is you elevate it and then FEMA not only has a provision that allows you to develop in the floodplain, but if you elevate it, they also have provision for you to remove that from the floodplain.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. CROCKETT: And so they've come back and said we don't need that floodplain. It's -- we won't need it, we don't need it. You're allowed to fill it all in. If you do, you can get what's called a letter of map revision, and we come back in and we say we've filled it, we give them the documentation, they

review it and then they say, okay, that portion is no longer in the floodplain.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do you know -- I used to live over there, and I know most of those apartments were there before I moved in, and that was -- God help me -- 25 years ago. Do you know when the last building was done on that site?

MR. CROCKETT: I do not know.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: I'm not sure what -- I mean, the PD plan was approved in 1984. I don't know the construction schedule when they were all built.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: I'm not familiar with that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I feel like some of it is pretty new, but maybe it just got repainted and looks newer.

MR. CROCKETT: Now, when you say pretty new --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I mean, relatively.

MR. CROCKETT: Twenty years and not forty years?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: I know there's some more recent development further to the -- to the east --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: -- that's not on this property, but I believe most of these units --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: So I believe most of the units in this development would probably date back into the '80s, maybe not '84, '85, but definitely I believe in the 80s.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. The stuff over in the -- between there and Highway 63 is probably what I'm thinking of.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. Yeah. Right. The one I know right where it says R-MF, I know that -- that area there is probably ten or fifteen years old.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Okay. Any other questions for Mr. Crockett tonight? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next speaker on this case, please come forward.

MS. DOKKEN: Dee Dokken, 804 Again. I'm going to make the standard Sierra Club comments that are made every time we're filling floodplain. For one thing, FEMA is very out of date. Rain events are much higher, and the regulations, letting people come in and just fill in, they're just saying, well, we're going to protect the structure. They aren't talking about what they're doing to the floodplain. The floodplain has -- the soils there have developed over hundreds, maybe thousands of years, are very absorbate. They're a big sponge to soak up water, and we are getting more and more of these heavy rain events. And when you fill it, you've lost that. So it may be legal. FEMA makes it legal, but they are --

they are obsolete maps and it's not good practice to build in the floodplain. Anything else?

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. Any questions for -- sorry. I thought you would give us a lot more tonight, Ms. Dokken. Next speaker, please come forward.

MR. MUSCATO: Hi, I'm Joe Muscato, 607 Randy Lane. I have a question and a comment. My property backs right up to the southeast corner on the other side of Hinkson Creek. So when you showed the plan, blew it up and you saw where the buildings are, I couldn't tell -- are they on -- still on the north side of Hinkson Creek? They're not on the south side? I couldn't tell.

MR. ORENDORFF: The Hominy Branch would be the southern one, and it would be north of that.

MR. MUSCATO: North of that.

MR. ORENDORFF: Yes.

MR. MUSCATO: Okay. In terms of what the discussion was we were just having, if you fill and raise that side, the north side, Hinkson Creek, does that increase the risk of flooding my property on the south side, and how is that -- how is that going to be measured, mitigated, or whatever? My question for, I guess, Mr. Crockett.

MR. DARR: Sure. I could -- I could field it, too, if -- so that's kind of where the floodway comes in when they do their -- when FEMA does their hydraulic modeling. They -- they try to -- they model it, and they determine the 100-year floodplain, the limits of the 100 year floodplain by calculating how much water they think is going to go through this drainage way, and the limits where the water will reach as far as horizontally the limits, and then vertically the elevation that it will reach. Then they do a separate model to establish the floodway, which is where you can't have any fill. That is a theoretical line that they -- they model it and it takes -- it's iterative, but they -- they push in the sides of each side of the floodplain as if it was being filled to infinity, and keep on filling it until they get an elevation that is one foot higher than what the natural 100-year elevation is. So that, theoretically, if you filled the entire floodplain, the floodplain, not the floodway, if you filled that entire area all the way up to the -- to the sky, then the 100-year elevation would not rise more than one foot. So if they filled their whole side, it's not going to raise the water any more than one foot, and that's where that two foot structure elevation has to be raised because, theoretically, all the area that they allow to be filled, if all that is filled, which probably would never happen, but if, theoretically, it was, the 100-year floodplain elevation would not rise more than one foot.

MR. MUSCATO: On the other side? On my side? Because that --

MR. DARR: Anywhere, yeah.

MR. MUSCATO: Okay. And I'm up pretty high. I'm on a bluff, so I'm up pretty high, but I just wondered about that.

MR. DARR: Yeah. Generally, one side is.

MR. CROCKETT: If you add to that --

MS. GEUEA JONES: To --

MR. CROCKETT: -- that's also assuming that area is -- (inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: We -- we can ask you to come later. Thank you, Tim. Anything else, sir?
Are there any other questions for this speaker?

MR. STANTON: I was just going to say, Madam Chair --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: You could definitely get that young man's information behind you or have a side conversation to kind of break that down a little better for you so you understand it.

MR. MUSCATO: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. Thank you very much for being here tonight. And, yeah, that question may be better answered outside of the public hearing between Mr. Crockett and Mr. Muscato, as it's probably very specific to that piece of property. Any other speakers here tonight? Please come forward.

MR. JOHN: Good evening. My name is John John, with offices at 1000 Nifong Boulevard, here tonight on behalf of my client, Dan Hagan. Dan Hagan developed that. The last building was built in about '87. He is fully in support of this. He just wanted me to come and make a comment that a couple of years ago, he came to get a little office zoning on the corner just in front of it, and the neighbors came out and opposed that. We hope that they get theirs, and then at some point when he -- he's not going to develop it. He's going to sell it to somebody who is going to put an office building on it, hopefully -- when he gets ready to do that, that this -- this body and the City Council will be in favor of it. If you've got any questions?

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

MR. JOHN: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak, please come forward.

MR. PARK: Good afternoon. So my name is Joontaek Park, and I live in 48 Broadway Village, so, basically, yeah, I am the tenant of this area. So, of course, they have posted whenever this to raise, my first concern was, oh, am I -- am I going to be evicted? But, okay, so as long if you clarify that, there is no building -- current building is demolished. Okay. That's okay. So one concern I want to raise is now currently this area, there is two entrances, but practically, so people because of there is a signal -- traffic signal, there is only one entrance that's used because of that in the morning. It's a -- (inaudible) -- so cars are lined up. So in this case, yeah, my concern is that the only entrance may be is going to be more crowded. Okay? So -- okay. That is one thing. And then the other concern is, yeah, I love this place just because it very low density and lots of green areas. Sad. But, you know, I -- (inaudible) -- to build more, because I cannot stop it. But there's one thing I can those SQE is just -- just preserve the current greenery as much as possible. I think that would be good for our current, so the tenants -- (inaudible) -- so I guess I could look on this column yesterday, so that's -- that's one thing I'm just asking. Okay. That's it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Thank you for being here tonight. Any questions? Thank you very much for being here. Next speaker on this case, please come forward.

MR. PACE: Hi. I am Rick Pace; I live at 5 Broadway Village.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you get a lot closer to that? I'm sorry. You tall folks, if we can repeat?

MR. PACE: Okay. I'm Rice Pace; I live at 5 Broadway Village. I'm in that neighborhood.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you state your address, please.

MR. PACE: 5 Broadway Village, Apartment H.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. PACE: What I'm curious about is along Moon Valley road, it goes through the floodplain and the flood -- whatever that other word was. Is that going to be accessed to the new development? If so, that's under water a lot. When it rains heavily, that's -- that's just, it's under water. Also along Moon Valley Road is a big sewer main, so I'm wondering if construction is done along, you know, on the -- on the south -- what is that -- southwest corner, will that affect the sewer main? If so, who is going to pay for that? And also along Green Valley Drive, if there's going to be more traffic, that's a shared bike lane. So there's -- there's considerations, I think, past flooding, because I mean -- and I guess another thing is, who is going to pay for the tenants' flood insurance because it's mandatory to have flood insurance in a floodplain. So is that going to be something that they'll have to do, or is that something that's going to have to be, you know, through the corporation Broad Park LLC? So those are the things I'm curious about.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. And I would encourage you to also get contact information. Thank you. Next speaker, please come forward.

MR. LANGDON: My name is Dennis Langdon, and I live at 2800 Green Valley. The same, we all live downstream. Well, I live right across the creek on Hominy Branch, and the one development that is more recent, 2700 Green Valley, has, I'm sure, created more flooding on my property. And they put some more buildings and more impervious pavement in the area, there's going to be even more. Our land is under trust. We have six acres, 6.6 acres and most of five acres of it is in trust and floods readily in high water. And another concern that he mentioned is the traffic. We have two drives that come in and anybody coming off of Broadway doesn't have a stop sign. It's a three-way stop sign, and everyone doesn't always recognize that three-way stop sign. It's a hazard. The bike path is a very blessed thing for our community. That's going to be impacted by this, too. Those are my words.

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

MR. LANGDON: It's a third of our property floods it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. If you want to come back to the microphone, you can, but otherwise we don't get you on the transcript.

MR. LANGDON: One-third of our property, at least, floods when there's heavy rains, and I know right next to that creek there, they're going to get water on that side. And it's -- if it doesn't go there, it's

going to come over on the other side.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Questions? No. Thank you very much. Any further speakers, please come forward.

MS. LANGDON: I'm Lea Langdon; I live at 2800 Green Valley Drive, and like my husband was saying, we live right -- right there. I just feel like this is a complicated enough proposal that they're asking to have it be easier to build here, and I think that's a mistake, you know. We've talked about how the FEMA has -- has sometimes changed the lines. There's climate changes that are happening. I don't think we know everything we need to know for the future. I think we need to have serious discussions every time there's a development change, and I am very concerned about these low areas that they're planning on building, and the effect as the -- as Dee had said about -- about the effect on the -- the water -- the water and the land. Anyway, that's my thoughts.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Langdon? Thank you very much for being here tonight. Next speaker? Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comments.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: Well, I think this is just good planning for the City. I don't see any issues with this. I think it's -- it's the way the City wants to go to get rid of the planned zoning, is it's a nightmare for staff to keep track of all the different revisions that might be there and site specific requirements and stuff like that. And with the new UDC, there's so many protections as far as buffering and screening and traffic and stormwater. It's only going to be good to rezone this to R-MF in my opinion. So I'm voting yes for this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other Commissioner comments? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Yeah. I'm going to echo Commissioner Darr's comments. I was -- initially there was some red flags with the flood zone stuff, but I think I've been satisfied with the answers I have received there. I'm kind of coming at this from, you know, let's just picture that none of these buildings are here. This wasn't developed. It's a green field. You know, would we rezone this today as R-MF? And I think the obvious answer to that is yes. So that's where I'm going to land.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other Commissioner comments? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Just a minor note, available to the last speaker. I think you're misunderstanding somehow about what -- what is easier, and I think actually what they're going to do is self-impose additional restrictions by making this change because the standards today are much more restrictive than they were 40 years ago. I'm not -- I'm not offering a blanket endorsement of everything that's being proposed, but I think there's often a misunderstanding about when a -- when someone proposes because they want to make it easier. It's just because they're -- even the staff no longer supports PD zoning. They don't want to ever see it happen again. So I don't see that as a major reason for doubting the wisdom of doing this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other comments? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I wanted to echo my -- my colleague that just spoke. He's correct. What it does is it makes it easier for us to bust Mr. Crockett's butt if he doesn't do what he needs to do, because when you zone it, then it comes with baked in regulations and tighter protections that a PD plan doesn't have instilled because it was a deal between the City and whoever developed it before. By it being rezoned, now we can really get in Mr. Crockett's -- you know, into his books there, and if he doesn't do what we want him to do, then it's easy for us to bust his butt. So I think this is the way to go.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further comments? Yeah. I mean, I would point to the portion of the staff report that specifically talks about its -- you know, about half way down page 1, there's a paragraph that specifically talks about all of the new UDC standards for stormwater, tree preservation, neighborhood protections, which includes screening, parking, et cetera, that were just nonexistent in 1984. When I look at the 1984 plan, compared to what a PD plan is today with, you know, a fully built out, you know, all of the -- all of the restrictions, all of the stated uses, all of the -- all of the things, this is pretty bare bones and doesn't require many of the things that our UDC requires specifically for environmental protection. I will be very curious to see if they're even able to get a floodplain permit for some of these areas, given especially the amount of impervious surface now. They may be able to, but I have faith that our -- our UDC and the current restrictions will require them to do a lot of study before they can break ground on anything new for sure. And I am very much in favor of dropping a lot of these older PD plans in favor of straight zoning for the reason that let's forget about the buildings. If they just want to replace the pool or take down the Pickle Ball court, and put up a bike shed, or anything, they have to come to us and go through this whole process again. There is no reason for that if they're just trying to, you know, renew some of their accessory buildings, or parking structures, or parking lots that may need to be upgraded. I mean, you know, talking about environmental protections, if they wanted to go in and replace all of their impervious parking surface with an impervious surface, they couldn't do that without coming to us. And so I think I'm in favor of getting rid of unnecessary regulation in favor of the very strict regulations that we already have in place through straight zoning, and that's kind of where my head is at. But if I am proven wrong, I will eat my words within five years, I'm guessing. Any further Commissioner comments? Anyone like to make a motion?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 335-2025, 1 Broadway Village rezoning, I move to approve the request to rezone the 73.75 acre -- acreage from PD, Planned Development, to R-MF, multi-family dwelling.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Walters, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Darr, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 7-0.

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

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