

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
January 4, 2024

Case Number 47-2024

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of P1316, LLC, and Discovery Business Park 1, LLC (owners) for approval of a PD Plan amendment to Lots 2 and 3 of the Discovery Business Park PD Plan. Proposed changes include revision of the uses on Lot 2, change of use on Lot 3 from office/artisan industry suites to a four-story, 48-unit residential building. Lot 3 is also to be divided to accommodate a regional storm-water facility. Revisions impact the northwest 4.86 acres of the overall PD Plan (Lots 2 and 3 only) with Lot 1 remaining unchanged. The site is located northwest of Nocona Parkway and Artemis Drive and includes the address 4900 Artemis 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 PD Plan and preliminary plat revision to the Discovery Business Park PD Plan.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, would any of the Commissioners like to recuse themselves from this case? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. We'll let you know when we move on. If any of my fellow Commissioners have had any outside contact with the parties to this case, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Thank you. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: You mentioned in the staff report that they're working with staff to ensure continued compliance with total buildable square footage and impervious coverage. Given that we have a lot of continued development and we're revisiting this plan all the time, I'm wondering if you can kind of walk me through, I guess, how that is revisited and what -- what takes place to monitor this?

MR. ZENNER: So as each -- so as a process that was established early on when development began at Discovery, the project has gone through multiple engineers over the course of its development. We established a procedure on the front end of tracking the development plans as they were being brought in, impervious area table that defines each of the development tracts. This particular development, if I recall correctly, has eight development tracts associated with it, so the spreadsheet identifies all eight development tracts, and it accounts for each of the developments as they are brought

in. So first floor area is inclusive, of course, of the footprint of a building, and then it includes any vertical construction above that. That gross into the gross floor area limitations that are associated with each development tract. Impervious coverage is also tracked the same way, but impervious coverage will only include the footprints, sidewalks, parking areas, and public streets. Each time a development plan is submitted, the spreadsheets are updated by the applicable applicant's engineer, and we are maintaining those spreadsheets at this point. We have also prepared and we are analyzing GIS data as it relates to the impervious covers through our data and comparing that against data that's being submitted to us by the consultant firms that are working within the project. We also are going to be going back and ensuring through plan review again of all of the approved development plans as to where we stand. Staffing challenges that I have had within the division and the department, we have not been able to get to that, but we do have a process by which that is possible to do, and we will be as quickly as we possibly can going back and reverifying. The concerns with the last two projects that have come in and for the last about a year and a half, almost two years, Crockett Engineering has been the engineer of record working with the Odles here in Discovery. We have had lengthy conversations as it relates to the accuracy of what is in these development tables. We are aware collectively that we are nearing the maximum limitations in certain tracts. The unique nature, however, of the way that the development -- the annexation and the zoning entitlements were provided to this property exist is that there is a lot of sharing between -- you can share impervious, and you can share gross floor area coverages between tracts in two different groups. And so as development is occurring in one tract and it may exceed what that tract says it can have, it draws from another tract that's underutilized its particular allocation, and that is where the concern really is coming to a greater head. At some point, we're going to end up potentially with a very significant portion of a development tract that has not been developed at this point or significantly developed with no possible development intensity left on it because everything else that's built within the project has been absorbed. It is that eventuality that we are continuing to have ongoing discussions with the current project engineer and the owner of the property as to how they want to proceed. The annexation of this project occurred in 2004 and it predates, of course, our storm-water ordinance. Many of the criterion that are established within the statements of intent with each development tract were prepared, of course, in the absence of a storm-water ordinance. Our current storm-water ordinance is superior to some of the monitoring requirements that the current zoning entitlement has with it, and so we have to balance any potential expansion against the underlying purpose of the original request and what our current code requirements would yield, and that is -- that's a little bit more of a significant conversation and an analysis that we just are not there yet. But to assure the Commission, every time we've looked at this project, we are looking at what is being absorbed. So that is -- that's the crux of how we're approaching this. We don't provide you all the table because there's a lot of -- we're going to have to do a lot of explaining of what the table means, not that you're capable of understanding that, it's just we've chosen that it's really not the principally relevant component of what you're here to review.

MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

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

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. STEPHENS: Hello, there. Jesse Stephens, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. And I do have a quick -- we have Jack Cardetti with me here today who is a representative of the owner and might be able to answer certain questions if you have them. So Pat did a great explanation on generally what we're trying to do, but as an overview, this is only pertaining to probably two-thirds of an original PD Plan that was approved. The one lot is not being touched, and that's the lot that is adjacent to Discovery Parkway. The main intent of this is trying to reorient the building in a way where we can put a residential unit and share -- and share a parking lot. The other thing is that, and having looked at this in great detail, we do have a need for another regional storm-water facility, and this is the desired location to put that for several reasons -- topography, relation to the discharges, et cetera. And then one thing that Pat did mention is we're continually monitoring this impervious area. One of the reasons why we're proposing this change, it actually does reduce the impervious cover for this PD Plan, and I'll show you a couple of pictures here. So here's kind of the original plan that was approved. It's pretty highly impervious and even behind the building that's built, that was intended to be, basically, access drive lanes for, you know, garage doors and the like for -- for service vehicles. The concept of the use has changed in a way that they don't think that's necessary and is opposed to building unnecessary impervious area that counts against us every time. We're choosing to reallocate that in a different way. So the shared parking makes great sense in terms of this overall idea of -- of trying to cut down on best used what impervious surface we had to work with. So you can kind of see -- Pat has already showed you this, but one of the challenges with the existing plan, too, is the grade of the street fell in the way that long -- what was originally proposed as a very long building that didn't work very well with the topography, and flipping the orientation this way works -- works much better. Obviously, we've got to do pretty extensive landscaping along the Artemis corridor, and, generally speaking, these storm-water detention facilities, they -- the end product is going to be probably something more than a weedy mess that you're used to seeing in a lot of places. The -- the one that's been built over further inward on the development has been turned into a very nice feature, an amenity with a walking trail, benches, landscaping. So when -- when done up, it can be very attractive and then the residents like it. So the parking lot will probably be deferred for some time that -- the goal is to get the regional facility up and running, but subsequent to this, we would submit a plan revision to eliminate the parking in the back of what's called 5,000 Artemis or Lot Five, and then a residential building, which will probably happen in pretty close proximity to one another. Utilities are in good shape here. It's all been master planned. We haven't really changed the utility scheme here other than the storm-water management feature of it. So no real issue in that regard.

MR. DUNN: I apologize. Can you speak into the mic?

MR. STEPHENS: Oh, yeah. No problem.

MR. DUNN: Thank you.

MR. STEPHENS: So I know there was a lot of discussion in the last project about traffic. Traffic

is not an issue here, and we do have -- you know, we're trying to provide an area that is -- is walkable, has green space amenities for residents that are -- the idea of having this green space amenity and a nicely done pond behind these residential units is actually an attractive feature. And with that, if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Anyone else here to speak? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments on this case? Seeing none. Anyone want to make a motion?

MR. DUNN: Go back to the --

MS. LOE: Yeah. If we can get back to the slide.

MR. ZENNER: Our folks back in the camera room do that for us.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. If we could get back to the staff slide that has the recommendation on it, that would be great. Thank you. Commissioner Dunn?

MR. DUNN: In the matter of Case Number 47-2024, as it relates to 4900 Artemis Drive PD Plan revision, I move to approve the requested PD Plan revision.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Dunn; seconded by Commissioner Loe. 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: Mr. Dunn, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Mr. Ford, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe. Recused: Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 7-0.

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

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