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MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a staff report, please?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, you may, Mr. Chairman. And I would like to apologize for the typographical error in the actual staff report in the description. It’s actually a 31.78-acre tract of land. That is what is shown on the C-P development plan. So we had a little bit of a discrepancy there in the acreage.

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the C-P development plan and preliminary plat.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Commissioners, any questions for Mr. Zenner? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have two questions. Director Zenner, you said the arborist felt the changes were fine and I'm just asking for a quick reminder here, and we designated that ability to the arborist, did we not, when we passed the new UDO that they can make those changes?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. The administration of screening and buffering still lies with the arborist.

MR. MACMANN: All right. The -- I'm glad we have this up. Parcel number -- second question. Parcel number 4, that's a bio-retention pond?

MR. ZENNER: That is. You will notice that there is a storm line that runs into the pond from the development.

MR. MACMANN: All right. My question is as follows: This plan is to sold/transferred, however, that takes place to the City. Right?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. Question: Will the City be maintaining the bio-retention facility for this development?

MR. ZENNER: It is my understanding, through the storm water covenants that will be required as a portion of the construction plans, no. We will have some arrangement through those storm water management requirements allocated, so the storm water retention, and I believe the folks the from Allstate Engineers that are engineers of record on this can probably provide you with a more thorough answer, but we do have a storm water covenant that will not obligate the City to maintain that, as I understand it, as it's been conveyed to me. The Parks Department wanted a water feature as part of the park, and obviously the applicant needs a water feature in order to meet their storm water requirements. So I'm sure if the covenant doesn't deal with it, the contract of the purchase will.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. I just -- I wanted to make sure that that was the -- given there are ongoing storm water problems and maybe this is -- some of this is a question for Attorney Caldera. Is it -- I mean, they're required to have bio-retention facilities if they don't have bio-retention facilities and it ends up being off site; do you understand -- you understand my concern here, and who's going to pay for this over time?

MR. ZENNER: We do allow that. We do allow off site and we do have developments -- commercial developments or other developments that do have off-site water retention facilities. Landmark Hospital, for example, is one of them. It -- so we do --

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. I do recall.

MR. ZENNER: -- we have a practice by which we have allowed in the past storm water features to be located off site. It happens to be that this is on property we will own, but the maintenance covenant will generally take care of the maintenance responsibility for that.

MR. MACMANN: I just -- there's a lot of i's and t's before we get to the end here, and I know this is preliminary. I just –

MR. ZENNER: And that's what Attorney Caldera and his boss will be reviewing before we get there.

MR. MACMANN: And that's -- I just wanted to get that on the record that these were concerns that I have. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions of staff? I have a question, Mr. Zenner, and you may not know off the top of your head. Is Albert -- Oakland-Albert the closest park? Is -- that would be -- is that -- I was just trying think, where's the nearest park?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. That is -- that is the closest. Albert-Oakland Park, which is to the west.

MR. STRODTMAN: West.

MR. ZENNER: The closest --

MR. STRODTMAN: And a considerable distance. I mean –

MR. ZENNER: The Parks and Recreation Department had indicated, and they had begun negotiations late last year into the early portion where we are in the year, and early this year, after the project had come in, and they have been looking for a park parcel in this particular area probably for the last ten years. Mike Schneider had conveyed that to me. And this opportunity presented itself. It took a little while to work out the details associated to the dedication and the purchase. However, the Parks Department feels that the protection of the existing 100-foot buffer and then the connections of the trails back down to -- from Pioneer down to Vandiver, and then, of course, the connection that's a private connection more so through the northeast corner of the property from Pioneer to Woodard, are all valuable benefits and assets to this particular area where we currently are underserved by park space. It is my understanding from some conversations and phone calls I have received, the development to the immediate north, there is a higher preponderance of rental housing within that particular area which really doesn't have any public space by which to partake in recreation activities, and this would provide an opportunity. The Parks Department has indicated to me while the money for acquisition exists, the money for actual improvement has not yet been allocated. As is the practice of the Parks and Recreation Department, when opportunities to acquire property present themselves through subdivision development or projects like this, they have a pot of money that they can utilize to act upon that, and then their next ballot issue would most likely either include this particular park or they'd be programming it for a future ballot issue.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Any additional questions, staff -- or staff -- Commissioners? I see none. I'll go ahead and open this up. It is a public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STRODTMAN: I would ask that you come forward, give us your name and address, and limit it to three minutes.

MR. BOLTON: Good evening, members of the Commission. My name is Wes Bolton. I'm with Allstate Consultants, 3312 Lemone Industrial Boulevard, 65201. I represent Allstate Consultants here representing the owners, RUM, Inc. We're very happy to be here tonight. As you may have gathered, it's been a long process, but we're very excited about this project. I'll keep my comments brief. Mr. Zenner covered almost everything. As he stated, it's a mixed use. All the uses we're proposing are approved in the zoning. I want to mention that these apartments are not student-centric apartments. This is -- this is market rate workforce apartments. It's nearby to the economic district as well as the highway, so we feel like this is a good spot, as well as it being transitional use from the commercial uses to the existing houses. We spent a good bit of time coordinating with Parks, and we're very excited to bring a park forward with this. Between the park and the loop, we know that this has been identified in the Park priority acquisition area for a long time, and so we're excited to add that to this development. As Mr. Zenner stated, as well, the owners have reached a verbal agreement related to the private covenant related to the restriction for -- for residential uses, so that's been taken care of. We -- they reached a verbal agreement this week, so -- to specifically speak to the pond question that Mr. MacMann had. The pond that's proposed on the parkland is just a wet pond. It's not a bio-retention or anything like that. It's a wet detention pond. Parks actually requested that we utilize that feature on their land and make it bigger so they could have a water feature. We will have some bio-retention on our site that we will maintain and we'll maintain all the storm infrastructure up to it. Parks actually wanted a water feature there. They asked us to bring more storm water to the pond and they had -- they plan to maintain that pond.

MR. MACMANN: Go ahead and finish your comments and we'll talk about that when you're done.

MR. BOLTON: Oh, sure. Sure. Sure. Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: Sure.

MR. BOLTON: So I -- I just wanted to mention, obviously, bio-retention requires a lot more maintenance than something like a wet pond, so I just wanted to make that distinction and let you know that that's how we arrived at the pond location and size was that they asked for that feature. Those are all the comments I have. Any questions you may have?

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, is there any questions for this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So characterizing it as -- I asked if it was a bio-retention feature essentially required for your -- this space that you use and it is not. It is a pond that is getting some storm water to bring water to it; is that a better characterization of what it is?

MR. BOLTON: Yes. It'll be used for detention, so just quantity detention. So just holding the water back, but not treating it or filtering it.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. So -- but this is part of your storm water retention plan?

MR. BOLTON: Correct.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MR. BOLTON: Correct. Yeah. You know, we -- we had this site laid out before we got the Parks comment of wanting a park.

MR. MACMANN: Right. And that's why I'm -- yeah. And we often -- you know, where we're going do it, we're going to put it over to the side or -- you know

MR. BOLTON: Sure. So, that's kind of where the site drains, too, so that's where we had that pond. We also will have another smaller pond on our area that will be used for detention, as well. It was drawn smaller, but Parks asked us to make it bigger so they could have a nicer water feature.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I just -- I just -- like him, I want to get these on the who pays for this and how and what -- I wanted to get that on record, but thank you very much.

MR. BOLTON: Sure. Of course. Of course.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions? I have one. In the staff report, we see -- it looks like there's a cluster or a mixture of one- and two-bedroom apartments between the different lots, but there's no three- or four-bedrooms. Correct? It's all one- or two-bedroom apartments?

MR. BOLTON: That's correct. It's one- and two-bedroom units.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yeah. Any covered parking?

MR. BOLTON: I don't believe there's any covered parking proposed at this time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Are there any other features for the guests of these apartments? I mean, is there a clubhouse, a pool, not the retention pond -- detention pond, but is there a pool or a clubhouse? Is there any activities planned?

MR. BOLTON: So right off the roundabout, just to the northwest, you can see -- it looks like a small square building with a little area behind it. That's the clubhouse and the pond.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. We're at number one, right about one?

MR. BOLTON: Correct. Yes. Correct.

MR. ZENNER: Pool. Pool, you mean?

MR. BOLTON: Yes. I'm sorry. I said pond. I guess you could swim in the pond if you wanted to, but we're going --

MR. STRODTMAN: We do in the country, but I guess –

MR. BOLTON: It's a pool. Yeah. It's a pool, for sure.

MR. STRODTMAN: And that would be -- that would be used by the apartment complex and not the neighborhood?

MR. BOLTON: Correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: And the park property is for the citizens?

MR. BOLTON: Absolutely.

MR. STRODTMAN: Got you.

MR. BOLTON: Yeah. And we tried to make a lot of connections to the surrounding areas, as well.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. I have no additional questions, so thank you, sir.

MR. BOLTON: Thank you.

MR. HOLLIS: Good evening. It's Robert Hollis, VanMatre Law Firm, 1103 East Broadway, here on behalf of the applicant. A pond would be better for Pat, maybe not a pool. Joke. That's Caddyshack. Right?

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. Thank you, Carl.

MR. HOLLIS: Just pointing that out. That's hilarious. Yeah. So I'm only here to answer questions if you have any about -- there was a transportation development district matter that was raised, so I would be happy to answer questions about that, as well as the Menard's issue, which is resolved. We're just working on documentation. So that's all I have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Attorney Hollis, how are you? You have a verbal agreement with Menard's?

MR. HOLLIS: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: To -- do you -- there's no -- my curiosity, when do you plan to get something in writing with them?

MR. HOLLIS: Well, yeah. The Menard's -- the Menard's attorney is in charge of drafting that and has drafted similar documents in the past, so we thought it would be more efficient if that's what -- that's how the responsibilities were allocated, but we're slow, so --

MR. MACMANN: Well, no. And that's fine. I just -- you know, we're -- we're getting along in this process and we have -- the reason I mentioned it is, like, this all sounds great, but we've got a few loose ends that aren't quite tied up yet; that's all.

MR. HOLLIS: Well, except that it's outside the purview of --

MR. MACMANN: And it is, and I was going bring that up. It's a private covenant which we have absolutely no -- that's between you all.

MR. HOLLIS: Right. Right.

MR. MACMANN: But we've had -- we had up north last year a private covenant come back and haunt a project, so that's why I wanted to bring that up.

MR. HOLLIS: I'm confident that we're -- that Menard's and my client will have this resolved and in writing. And, again, it's outside this purview, but --

MR. MACMANN: That's all I had.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Were there conversations or input from the little notched R-1 area?

MR. HOLLIS: I don't know about a little R-1 area.

MS. BURNS: It's -- well, right -- no. Right here, it's the little notched-out area.

MR. HOLLIS: The O-1?

MS. BURNS: Is it O-1? I'm sorry. I thought it was –

MR. HOLLIS: It's O-1, I think.

MR. BOLTON: That's -- that's R-1.

MS. BURNS: It will be the park.

MR. HOLLIS: It's R-1 today, but it will be the park.

MS. BURNS: Okay. I thought -- it looked like there were some buildings there, and I just didn't know -- on one of the -- on the aerial shot from one of the maps, there looked like there were buildings.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? I have a quick question. Explain it -- your TED. How -- how is that applying to the apartments? I mean, it's traditionally a sales tax; correct?

MR. HOLLIS: It is, so it has no bearing whatsoever --

MR. STRODTMAN: No -- no bearing. So they will --

MR. HOLLIS: Not at all.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- they will not contribute to the TED, it would be from the -- the commercial?

MR. HOLLIS: Not at all. Right.

MR. STRODTMAN: I was wondering if you figured out a way to do that.

MR. HOLLIS: Oh, there's a way, but, no. There are no assessments or real estate taxes imposed, so it's just sales tax.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. Yeah. So they won't contribute?

MR. HOLLIS: Correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. HOLLIS: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone else who would like to come forward and speak on this item, we would take you at that time. Quite the gentleman, ladies first.

MS. TURNER-MEYERS: Good evening. My name is Nancy Turner Meyers, and I'm a resident of the Third Ward. My home is located at 4508 Mexico Gravel Road, approximately one mile east of the proposed development. I drive by this location approximately three or four times per week, so I consider myself somewhat familiar with and knowledgeable about the area that's under discussion. While I understand there is a need for it, I'm a firm proponent of affordable housing. I have several concerns about the plans for Centerstate Apartments. They could be summarized as relating to density, safety, and recreation, and other accommodations for families who would be the potential residents of these apartments. In terms of densities -- density, according to the Commission report, slightly more than -- well, now we know -- I thought it was 36, approximately, but now it's been amended even down from there to only 31.7-acre tract is the home to 304 units consisting of 176 one-bedroom and 128 two-bedroom family apartments, so I'm assuming that to mean children included, for a potential total of at least 864 residents in this small area. I believe that this space is entirely inappropriate for such a large residential development, especially located where it is adjacent to a busy U.S. Highway -- U.S. 63, and fronted by Vandiver Drive, a busy commercial corridor that's home to several trucking companies, most notably United Parcel Service -- UPS. This location leads me to my second serious concern, which is for the safety of the residents and others who traverse this road. The speed limit currently is 45 miles per hour, and I've often observed cars traveling at higher speeds, especially those exiting from U.S. 63 and the many 18-wheeler trucks heading to and from UPS and other the trucking companies located on this corridor. The recently release Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety final report and recommendations, a hefty 60-page document, makes very clear that -- although there were a few issues that were controversial in that report, mostly, I gathered, having to do with red-light cameras, but aside from that, pedestrian safety is a major priority for this City with an underlying philosophy of vision zero, meaning that we can prevent accidents by proactive thinking, careful forethought, and planning, and it lays out strategies that can be used in the categories of education, enforcement, and engineering for this to be accomplished. Additionally, there have been numerous local studies and reports on the desirability and walkability of walkable and bikeable neighborhoods. To me, it seems this development is clearly at odds with the recommendations of these reports, given the safety issues, primarily, given the recommendations and the will of the many Columbians that this report -- these reports represent. My final point concerns recreational activities and other activities for the residents, especially children. And I ask you to keep in mind that I wrote this prior to hearing information about the park that is planned, so I wasn't sure exactly what that entailed, and I have to say I still have a question about is this park plan in fact -- has it been secured, because I think that's a major concern, because it doesn't appear to me to be a certainty that there is going to be parkland there providing recreational opportunities for kids. While I'm sure there are going to be sidewalks -- we've heard all about sidewalks, but you've heard of the bridge to nowhere. I'd like to compare it to the sidewalk to nowhere. There's really nowhere to walk out there. What is there around the neighborhood?

MR. STRODTMAN: Ma'am, I'd ask you to wrap it up, if you could.

MS. TURNER-MEYERS: Okay. Okay. That's my main concern, that there -- there isn't anywhere to walk in the neighborhood, so the sidewalks don't help that much. We really do need to take into consideration these are children who, researchers show, and I'm sure your own experience has shown that they need places to play and to run, and I think we can all agree that running out into a dangerous road is not something we want to happen. These are big concerns.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Commissioners, is there any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, ma'am. Appreciate you coming in. Yes, sir.

MR. SCHROEDE: My name is Walter Schroede, and I live at 2705 Isherwood Drive, where I've lived for 52 years. And when we bought the house, we knew very well that this land was going to be developed. The City is spreading geographically and over those -- that half-century, we've watched it change from George and Mary Frances Ridgeway's proposed development of single-family homes there and they're selling it to Woody Woodard, and then Centerstates comes in, the highway comes in, and it's been a changing scene. And, of course, that's life. I go along with this -- with this proposal. However, I have some questions. I'm a walker, and I have some questions concerning what I heard first, trails, and then, secondly, the word, sidewalks, is being used, particularly on the south edge of Pioneer Drive. This is an unimproved street right now, built on a section line from an old County ingress road into the Ridgeway property, and I don't know where the boundaries of the public right-of-way are. I know there's power lines on the south side, and I'm wondering whether the trail/sidewalk is going to be built on the private property or on City right-of-way, and whether a -- if it's a sidewalk, a concrete sidewalk is going to be built against an unimproved road with no curbs and gutters in it. That sort of puzzles me as to what is really meant in this south side of Pioneer Drive sidewalk to nowhere, as she suggests, because there are no other -- there are no sidewalks anywhere in the Henley Subdivision. Fifty-two years, there have been no sidewalks.

MR. STRODTMAN: Sir, I can maybe try to help a little bit on clarification, just by basically looking at the plan, and I don't know that much more. But it's -- they're sidewalks. I don't think that they're trails. Everything that I see specifically says sidewalks. Now, I may be incorrect on that and we might have to clarify that with the applicant, but it looks to me as that they're sidewalks. And that -- that particular sidewalks, all the sidewalks that I see would be in the City-owned property area. The land that's now currently the applicant's, but will be transferred to the City is where the sidewalks would reside, would be in the City-owned area of the land.

MR. SCHROEDE: It would be under the power lines or on the north side of the property?

MR. STRODTMAN: It looks like the power lines maybe cut across the corner. Am I looking at that right?

MR. SCHROEDE: The power lines go along Pioneer, from Route B, all the way down to Woodard Lane.

MR. STRODTMAN: We'll probably may be requesting one of the applicant's engineers to come forward in here a second to maybe clarify that, if the Commissioners are okay with that. Do you have any additional discussion?

MR. SCHROEDE: The sidewalks will stop at the edge of the developments; is that it?

MR. STRODTMAN: Correct.

MR. SCHROEDE: So if people use the sidewalks, they're going to have get out into Mexico Gravel to continue walking.

MR. STRODTMAN: They would have to go back to where they're walking today, which is Mexico Gravel. So, you know, we have to start the sidewalks somewhere, and eventually we do want connectivity of all of our sidewalks. But we have to start somewhere and I understand this is -- had no sidewalks for 52 years, but this subject site is being redeveloped, so it is our opportunity to require sidewalks on that property. If any of the other properties along Pioneer were to be redeveloped or changed or rezoned or needed to come back forward to us, you also would have to put in a sidewalk in your parcel and eventually we would have connectivity. It may be 52 years from now, but at some point that sidewalk will be connected to something and we have to start somewhere. And this is a big chunk of sidewalk that we're going to get at once as opposed to --

MR. SCHROEDE: Yes, it is.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- 60 feet, 100 feet, or -- you know.

MR. SCHROEDE: I'm very happy to get the sidewalks, but the street will remain an unimproved street.

MR. STRODTMAN: Correct. Until at such time that the City has in their CEPI that they have a plan to address your Pioneer, which I don't know where that stands.

MR. SCHROEDE: And the two connecting lengths between Pioneer and to the south are going to be concrete, too?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, sir.

MR. STRODTMAN: It's described as sidewalk, so I assume that they'll be concrete, yes. You know, legal sidewalks for a sidewalk purpose. We'll let anybody else speak that would like to, and then we might ask one of the engineers to come back up and clarify that for us, if you don't mind. Thank you for coming up, sir.

MR. KEMBLE: Hi. My name is Nile Kemble. I live at 3000 East Henley. I'm the neighborhood president of the Mexico Gravel Neighborhood Association. I didn't really come tonight knowing much of anything. I learned this evening I missed an information meeting somehow. I don't think any of the other neighbors were involved in that. I know Brian said he talked to somebody, but nobody that is in our immediate area has come forth to me to discuss that. Ms. Burns, the little notched out area is actually a church, so I don't know if it's zoned R-1, but it's actually a church, so --

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. KEMBLE: Uh-huh. And then the pond is actually just a dry swamp area right now, so a pond would be wonderful.

MR. MACMANN: I have walked it.

MR. KEMBLE: Okay. Okay. What I do want to get on record tonight is that the neighborhood association does have some concerns with the 304 units. That's providing everybody that moves into that -- that development has a car, that's 304 more vehicles using that area. I talked with Mr. Zenner the other day and he informed me that Vandiver was going to be potentially widened to handle the traffic. However, if you go west on Vandiver, once you leave that area, I don't see how you can develop Vandiver going west out of there to meet that kind of traffic need without buying out a lot of businesses. The street just isn't wide enough and there are trucks and things -- vehicles parked along that. Woodard is not going to be able to carry any -- much additional load than what it is right now, just because it's just going to dump it back into Mexico Gravel, which is already still quite busy. We have some concerns over safety. We've watched over the years as -- as you have seen, this development from when it originally was planned has gone nowhere. For whatever reason, nobody wants to come north. And the concern is is that in two or three years and this apartment complex doesn't fill, what happens to it? The track record up north isn't real good. It's an elephant in the room; I understand that, but we're not against affordable living, affordable homes, but we are concerned about safety if something were not to go as planned. So that's the concerns we want to bring forward tonight.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Mr. Kemble, can you -- on the plan that's on your screen, is your HOA, are you on the north side there? Is that --

MR. KEMBLE: We are on the east side. We are the last street before Woodard Drive. That was West Henley, and that's -- that's the street I live on right here.

MR. STRODTMAN: So the entire northern section of homes is not all part of your HOA?

MR. KEMBLE: It is, but a lot of the homes to the west of my home, and the two Henleys is now rental units already. There are apartment buildings tucked back in there, along with the single-family homes that have become rental, so it's -- it's not like there are not apartment complexes in that area.

MR. STRODTMAN: All right. I was just curious where your --

MR. KEMBLE: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- where your -- where you connected to this, just -- or just like I understood.

MR. KIMBALL: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: I didn't know for sure if you were on the far left there on the west. I wasn't for sure, or the north, so I was just curious.

MR. KIMBALL: More like we're on the east of the -- north and east of that, so --

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. And I don't know how the communication, but that would be something that I would obviously recommend the applicant make sure that he has -- gets your contact before you leave tonight so --

MR. KEMBLE: I will say Allstate was -- when this all originally started, Allstate was great, and I have no doubt that now that they've heard our concern, that they'll work with us. I just wanted to make sure you guys knew that the neighborhood had concerns, so --

MR. STRODTMAN: Good. Well, we appreciate you coming in and we do -- may have some questions for you, so -- are you okay? Are you done?

MR. KEMBLE: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, is there any questions for this speaker? Mr. Stanton, do you have a questions?

MR. STANTON: Evening. What's your solution? What are your suggestions to fixing your concerns, if it was up to you?

MR. KEMBLE: I don't know right off the top of my head. I -- I got the original notice that this was going on two days ago, so I haven't even had a lot of time to sit down and digest what was going on. Again, I found out tonight I missed an informational meeting. I'm not sure why. I wouldn't be opposed necessarily. I love the park idea. I think that's a great addition to the neighborhood. As they said, Oakland is the closest one, and that's not walkable for small children anywhere near us. Three hundred and four more apartments in a town that just has built multiple, multiple apartment buildings in the downtown area and around town just seems like an awful lot.

MR. STANTON: Less density --

MR. KEMBLE: Density. Yes.

MR. STANTON: And you said safety, so what do you mean, safety? Are you talking traffic safety? Are you talking crime? Are you talking --

MR. KEMBLE: Crime. I mean, again, it's -- a lot of the newer developments in the north end of town quickly become low-income housing. And, unfortunately, there tends to be a crime that goes along with that a lot of times. Not always, but a lot of times. And that's awful close to our neighborhood to have potentially a safety issue.

MR. STRODTMAN: Good, Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Uh-huh. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? I see none. Thank you,

Mr. Kemble. Any additional speakers like to come forward that have not spoken yet? Please come on up. You can come -- you can come to the podium and ask a question.

MS. RUDEBUSCH: Are you saying on the other proposal that was earlier or is it on this one?

MR. STRODTMAN: We're only talking about -- we’re only working on Case 17-74.

MS. RUDEBUSCH: I’ll wait. Thank you.

MR. LORANDI: Good evening. My name is David Lorandi; I live at 208 Hirth Avenue, and I'm also a -- an investor here in Columbia. I'm a young citizen of this City. I love this City, and I'm actually just here to -- just a general comment. I'm actually super happy that this is happening -- this development, and especially that this housing will be two-bedroom, one-bath, because that's -- that's a good trend to have for our young people who are just graduating from college and just trying to, you know, get a good job and then just, you know, save money, and then eventually invest into their biggest asset that they will have, a house. So, I just wanted to say that I'm excited to see this development be finished. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, is there any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, sir, for coming.

MR. LORANDI: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional speakers like to come forward on Case 17-74? Commissioners, did we want to have the engineering group come forward to clarify questions? So, sir, state your name and address again, and just please stick with the question that was at hand and no further exploration.

MR. BOLTON: Absolutely. Absolutely. Wes Bolton, Allstate Consultants, 3312 Lemone Industrial Boulevard, 65201. I just wanted to clarify a couple of points. Related to density, we feel with the park and with the 63 percent green space that we have, it's not a very dense development, much less dense than it could be. We feel like it's making this area of the community much more bikeable and walkable.

MR. STRODTMAN: Can we just -- the sidewalk is really -- we don't want you to have a chance to rebuttal against the other side, so just -- we just want to clarify the sidewalk discussion that the one citizen brought forward --

MR. BOLTON: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- is just kind of clarify how the sidewalks are going to be structured and --

MR. BOLTON: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. I misunderstood.

MR. STRODTMAN: No. We just want you to clarify the sidewalks and not give you a chance to rebuttal.

MR. BOLTON: So -- so some of the reason for the confusion between sidewalks and trails, we've been working with Parks for so long to try to make this loop happen. And so, we've called it a trail, we've weaved it a little bit more. The plan that we've put forward is -- is traditional sidewalks all around the entire site at the location inside the City right-of-way where it would normally be required. So we tried to get fancy with it, but we -- we just sent forward a plan with the proposed sidewalks. Now, we have additional sidewalks that are going from on the west side of the property from north to south that aren't in right-of-way. They're on the private property, just to make sure that it connects all the -- all the infrastructure to make a loop and connects the community.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Commissioners, are there any questions on the sidewalk discussion matter? Yes, Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: So where are the sidewalks on Pioneer? I think that's what the gentleman was concerned with.

MR. BOLTON: Sure.

MR. STANTON: Are there -- left, right side, or –

MR. STRODTMAN: I think it would back of curb. Is there a curb on Pioneer or is it --

MR. BOLTON: No curb on Pioneer. And so -- so we're dedicating an additional right-of-way.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. BOLTON: So there's a 25-foot half-width right-of-way, so significantly more right-of-way. The road, I believe, is probably 22, 24 feet wide currently, so it'll be a 50-foot right-of-way. The sidewalk will go one foot inside that right-of-way. So it'll -- it'll be outside the ditch, outside the asphalt. I'm not sure where it falls in relation to the power lines off the top of head. I apologize.

MR. STANTON: But you have to take some of that tree line out. Right?

MR. BOLTON: I don't recall.

MR. STANTON: On north side or housing side, that's what I'm trying to --

MR. BOLTON: I don't -- I don't believe so. I think it's -- I believe -- the 100-foot buffer is inside the lot, and so that's not going away. The 100-foot buffer isn't going away at all. There could be some minor clearing at the edge, but -- bit it won't be the 100-foot buffer.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. BOLTON: And then the sidewalk will just be placed in its traditional -- traditional place, where the City requires the sidewalk to be placed within the right-of-way.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners, of the sidewalks, specifically? Thank you for coming up. Appreciate that. Sorry for the confusion.

MR. BOLTON: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Is -- last call for any additional discussion on Case 17-74. I see none. We'll go ahead and close this public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I heard the concerns from the neighbors that are close. I -- you're right. The north side of town does have a bad track record in its occupancy, but I think that's because their intent wasn't to be rental property. I think like a lot of north side stuff was supposed to be condos and they advertised that way and then 2007, 2008 happened, and they had to do what they had to do. I think this is different because, number one, we have starving need for one- and two-bedroom units, and those type -- the people that those generally serve are older or upstart young professionals. I don't -- I think the market that they're hitting initially and designing to kind of mitigates that. I'm not saying because, hey, anything can happen, but I think this is a great use of that area and a good adjustment and buffer from the -- the industrial developments behind it, so I plan to support it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Additional ques-- comments, Commissioners? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I agree with Mr. Stanton. There is a definite lack of one- and two-bedroom apartments, affordable living for -- for that area. So, I mean, I could see someone that works at Menard's actually living there. Wouldn't that be wonderful?

MR. STANTON: American Air Filter and --

MS. RUSSELL: I'm going to support this.

MR. STANTON: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anybody like to form a motion for discussion? Ms. Russell? Change it up a little.

MS. RUSSELL: In the case of 17-74, RUM, Inc., I move that we approve the C-P plan and the preliminary plat.

MR. TOOHEY: I'll second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Russell, for that motion, and Mr. Toohey for the second. Commissioners, is there any discussion on the motion that is at the table for us? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Russell. Motion carries 7-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries seven to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.