

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**February 8, 2024**

**Case Number 68-2024**

**A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of 2000 Allen Lane, LLC (owner) for approval to rezone 15.17 acres to R-MF (Multi-Family Residential) and 3.42 acres to M-C (Mixed-Use Corridor). The 18.59-acre subject site is located at 2000 Allen Lane, and is currently split-zoned R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) and MN (Mixed-Use Neighborhood.)**

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 requested rezoning of the subject site to include 15.17 acres of R-MF and 3.42 acres M-C as depicted on the rezoning exhibits.

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Palmer, you might not have this information. The Wolcott Lane and the Allen Lane, those homes there -- Mr. Zenner may know this -- they were in the county at one time. Those houses are '40s or something like that. I'm just wondering when they were zoned M-N. Do we know that answer to that question?

MR. PALMER: I don't know directly, but I do know that the Rangeline corridor and probably this end of the Vandiver corridor were rezoned as part of a broad rezoning. Especially the Rangeline corridor, I know, was generally zoned M-C for a large swath of it as part of the -- you know, a wholesale zoning code adoption at some point, like --

MR. MACMANN: I just wanted -- they've been single-family homes for generations, so I just kind of wondered when they got -- did that. Next question. Let's go back to the current zoning map, like, two back, if we could. There we go. For the sake of our audience, I'm going to go over buffering and setbacks. That lower section, which is M-C, or proposed to be M-C, which is currently M-N, what type of buffer would be on Allen Lane, if any, between that and the properties to their immediate west?

MR. PALMER: So on Allen Lane, on the frontage there would be nothing, but there -- there is a strip that will be dedicated as additional right-of-way, so there's a bit of a spatial buffer there. But, you know, landscaping and screening, there won't be any. It'll be basically the frontage of the lot, so --

MR. MACMANN: I just worried about lighting with future M-C developments.

MR. ZENNER: So lighting, Commissioner MacMann, that is actually covered within the City's lighting ordinance which does specify that lighting bleed-over from the commercial lot that would be to the east of Allen Lane, is going to be controlled to, if I'm not incorrect, a half a foot candle from the edge of that parcel outward. So one would expect that as a part of the lighting analysis that's submitted with the construction on the proposed M-C, that we would be seeing those lighting, by the time it reaches the western edge of the property or the right-of-way, you will have a reduction -- significant reduction in that bleed.

MR. MACMANN: Part of this I'm just going over for the value of the record as for our guests we have this evening. Now, up above, we have the billing to R-MF. What type of buffering will we see to the east-west line there on that --

MR. PALMER: So our R-MF -- the R-MF wouldn't have buffering. There is no -- zero. It's a zero-buffering requirement.

MR. MACMANN: And what's the zoning just north of the property?

MR. PALMER: I'm sorry. I must have misunderstood. The -- the R-MF, the orange there to the north of the subject property --

MR. MACMANN: That's R-MF. Right?

MR. PALMER: Right. Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: And to the west?

MR. PALMER: To the west is R-1.

MR. MACMANN: That's R-1? Okay. (Inaudible.)

MR. PALMER: Yeah. The lighter yellow is R-1.

MR. MACMANN: I'm sorry?

MR. PALMER: The lighter yellow there is R-1.

MR. MACMANN: All right. That's -- thank you. I'm glad we're both on the same page. I was not following either of us. What would be the buffer between the R-MF and the R-1?

MR. PALMER: I believe that's a level two buffer. That should --

MR. MACMANN: Could you describe that to us, please?

MR. PALMER: That is an eight-foot landscape strip, I believe. Do you have that handy? It may be a level one too.

MR. MACMANN: Height, depth, opacity, that type of thing?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. If memory serves, it may be a level one, because I -- I think it was only landscaping. So hang on a second. Let me double check.

MR. ZENNER: Multi-family to single, pursuant to buffering and transitions table is a level two buffer. I apologize. Single family and two-family is a level one buffer. A level one buffer is a six-foot-wide landscape strip. However, neighborhood protection standards, as Mr. Palmer pointed out, would come into play if structures greater than 30 feet are within 25 feet of the property line, they need to be reduced in height to 24, or an additional ten feet of setback needs to be applied.

MR. MACMANN: All right. That's -- that's all -- all my questions for right now. Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else with questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public hearing.

### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please state your name and address for the record. We allow for six minutes for the applicant and groups, and three minutes for individuals.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I'm here tonight representing Jeff Pfannenstiel, who is with me tonight. Again, just a real quick overview. I believe Mr. Palmer did a good job going through the process. We are asking for a rezoning from M-N and R-1 to M-C and R-MF. This is an infill development in the City of Columbia utilizing existing infrastructure, both existing roads, water, sewer, and electric. Again, here's the -- you know, the location of the site. You can see across the street, across Vandiver, you have the heavy use car dealerships. You've got some other commercial uses right in front. You've got Parker Street Mobile Home Park. And then, of course, you have Bear Creek to the north of us, which is a housing -- a Columbia Housing Authority property. Again, I think this is an exhibit that you've seen before. This is the current zoning map, so you have R-MF to the north, you've got some M-C to the south, some M-N, some R-MH, which you don't see much of that. We've got R-MH and PD to the -- to the east, and then R-1 to the west. This is what we're asking for, so that, again, we're asking for an R-MF and M-C. So we believe it fits in with the area. You can kind of see how the lines are drawn. We believe that works with -- with the existing zonings in that vicinity. You've seen a copy of the preliminary plat, and I'm going to kind of -- this is just for the zoning, but to help answer some of the questions, I think the preliminary plat that kind of -- kind of coincides with the public hearing for the zoning. This is the street that goes through the property. From the Housing Authority property to the north, again, here it is -- let me get here. Here's an exhibit that shows the Housing Authority to the north and the street that's currently serves the Housing Authority. It's about a 2,000-foot-long cul-de-sac that serves about 76 residential units on a single point of access. So that's about two and a half times more the number of units that we would normally be allowed to have on a single point of access in today's developments, but it does have a stub to our property, as indicated by the green arrow. This development would connect that street back to Vandiver, which would provide a secondary ingress/egress for the development to the north. And consequently, you can see how it goes to our -- to our site. This is the road that comes through our site, and then here's a large overhead power line easement that runs through the property. And, Mr. MacMann, this kind of helps your questions a little bit because you can see the vegetation that's on the west side of that power line is basically useless to us. We can't really utilize it. Therefore, it's going to remain an existing vegetation along that power line corridor, so that's going to provide a natural buffer that's out there that's going to far exceed the level two buffer that would be required. Of course, it kind of comes through the property, as well, to kind of render some of the R-MH property not usable in

some locations. So when we talk about the acreage that's before you, really the net density is not going to be nearly as high as it would seem, especially when you add in the tree preservation portion of the tract as -- as shown in this depiction, you can kind of see that really the R-MH is much smaller than the acreage that has been presented. The M-C to the south, of course, again, usable net acreage down there is about two and a half acres on a couple of lots that come off of Allen Lane extended. My client has met with the properties to the west, including the R-1 -- several R-1 properties to the west, and have gotten no opposition from those residents. So we've been very fortunate and very grateful for their -- for their discussions and input. Again, this kind of overlaps both the zoning, as well as -- as well as the preliminary plat, but I thought that the preliminary plat discussion was relevant for the zoning portion. So, again, the request is consistent with the goals and objectives of Columbia Imagined. Mainly, we're talking about including and promoting infill development. It promotes an increase in density around already existing infrastructure. It's compatible with the area, and it comes to you with support of City staff. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions regarding the zoning or the preliminary plat if that's prudent, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick. Mr. Crockett, for you and your client, just -- I'm just covering bases here.

MR. CROCKETT: Sure. I understand.

MR. MACMANN: An existing area, we've got to make sure we get all --

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. Understand completely.

MR. MACMANN: -- all the i's and t's and p's and q's. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, sir. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Crockett, I was going to save this for the preliminary plat, but since you brought it up in your presentation, I'm interested in the connection to the Columbia Housing Authority property to the north.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. LOE: I realize the connection is labeled as Jolene, but it appears to be constructed as a driveway going through a parking lot with utility poles in the way.

MR. CROCKETT: Right.

MS. LOE: So what has the conversation been like, or who is making those improvements?

MR. CROCKETT: That is --

MS. LOE: There also appears to be a zero lot line with one of the --

MR. CROCKETT: There is really -- I'm sorry.

MS. LOE: Okay. No. Just -- there seem to be some barriers --

MR. CROCKETT: Sure. You're right.

MS. LOE: -- with making that --

MR. CROCKETT: There is some platted right-of-way. Jolene Drive is a platted right-of-way, so there is actually platted street right-of-way for that -- for that road extension. Hence, the reason why we're forced or required to make that connection. And also in doing that, yes. There is a power pole there. It's just a light pole. That can easily be moved. Those are all things that have been -- have been discussed. And then, of course, this is something that's going to -- when that portion develops, that area requirements -- those construction requirements are put on the developer for the --

MS. LOE: So the developer is going to make that connection?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. LOE: Through the Elleta? Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

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

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there anyone else to speak on this case? If so, please come forward.

MR. HARR: Dave Harr, 1313 Vandiver Drive. I own the property, it's more than you can see on your map there, on the east side on Vandiver, of their property. How many units -- I don't know -- I don't want the answer near my -- my speech here, but I would just like to know how many units are going to be built on the backside of that. My big comment is that at one time, a City official told me that they fully realize that Vandiver would be four lanes someday. Well, is this that someday coming up now? When you have Rangeline, it's closing time, people want to get out from downtown, Rangeline is a backed-up street, Vandiver is a very backed-up street. Vandiver could be backed up all the way up the hill on the east end up there up to where the bread company used to be and beyond. So are we going to have plans -- contingent plans for the relief, the parking, the driving lanes on Vandiver if you're going to dump a bunch of more cars, traffic onto it? I'd like to know some numbers. The -- also, you also have the headache of car dealerships always parking in the middle of the lane, which I find unusual since they -- I don't think anybody else can do that, and unload their business out there. So things like that need to be addressed. The way it is now, it's dangerous for ambulances, fire trucks, police like it is when you have the middle of the road blocked up and then, you know, poor traffic flow through there. So that's my big -- big speech.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: A comment. I totally hear you on the issue of the car dealerships unloading where they do unload. That's a battle I lost when we wrote the UDC. They have the right to do that, although I find it problematic, as do you. As far as the number of units that go back there, I didn't catch the size of Mr. Crockett's preservation buffer, but it's probably, like, six acres, seven acres, five acres? Sixty, sixty-five units, it's hard -- that's just my ballpark.

MR. HARR: Are they double story?

MR. MACMANN: I know how many can go in there, but they're not going to get all that. I'm trying to do this without engaging him. I'm sorry. They don't have plans for that. R-MF would allow them to put up to six units per acre, but they're not going to get six units per acre because of they are going to have to preserve trees and they're going to have to do action for storm water, and they're losing some right-of-way to the roads. So maybe four an acre, something back there, and it still could be potentially 60 units. But as -- they have no plan right now. They're just asking for a rezoning to allow to do that type of activity.

MR. HARR: Well, I'm happy to see that there will be a connection at least to one road. Shame on the City Council, shame on even this Board for allowing the right-of-way that was in that PD. There was a 25-foot right-of-way next to my east property line. And someday they said they would come back to me and ask for a 25-foot right-of-way. That's back when right-of-ways were 50 foot. They decided to vacate that. Now we're going back to try to find right-of-way is very difficult.

MR. MACMANN: Again, I'm with you, sir. I don't think we should do that, but that's a battle neither one of us apparently have won.

MR. HARR: Yeah.

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

MR. HARR: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case? Going once , going twice. Okay. We'll close public hearing and go into Commissioner comment then.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any Commissioner comments? Would anyone like to make a motion? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: In the matter of Case 68-2024, Allen -- 2000 Allen zone -- Allen Lane rezoning request, 50.17 acres to R-MF and 3.42 acres to M-C, 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 this motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, when you're ready, may we have a roll call?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting yes: Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson. Motion carries 7-0.**

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: That motion will be forwarded to City Council.