



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Thursday, June 18, 2020

7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Council Chambers

Columbia City Hall

701 E. Broadway

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. LOE: I would like to call the June 18, 2020 Planning and Zoning meeting --  
Commission meeting to order.

MS. LOE: Ms. Burns, may we have roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes. We have eight; we have a quorum.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

**Present:** 8 - Tootie Burns, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Lee Russell, Anthony Stanton, Brian Toohey,  
Michael MacMann and Valerie Carroll

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

#### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner, are there any adjustments or additions to the agenda?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, ma'am.

MS. LOE: May I get a --

MS. RUSSELL: I move to approve the agenda.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Thank you. Second by Mr. MacMann. I'll take a thumbs up  
for approval of the agenda.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: Looks unanimous.

**Approved Agenda**

#### IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### June 4, 2020 Regular Meeting

MS. LOE: Everyone should have gotten a copy of the June 4 regular meeting  
minutes. Were there any adjustments or modifications to those?

MS. RUSSELL: I move to approve those minutes.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. I'll take a thumbs up on the approval of the  
meeting minutes.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: It looks unanimous. Thank you.

**Approved Minutes**

**V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

MS. LOE: That brings us to our first public hearing of the evening.

**Case # 116-2020**

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of T-Vine Enterprises Inc. (owners), to rezone two parcels from R-1 (One-family Dwelling) to A (Agricultural). The property is addressed 6114 N. Oakland Gravel Rd.

MS. LOE: May we get a staff -- we'll do recusing before or after the staff report?

MR. ZENNER: It would be before.

MS. LOE: Before. So --

MR. TOOHEY: Madam Chair, I need to recuse myself from this case.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Toohey. Are there any other Commissioners who would like to? I see none. May we get a staff report, please

Staff report was given by Mr. Brad Kelley of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval the requested rezoning from R-1 to A.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Kelley. Before we ask staff any questions, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to this meeting related to this case to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of the case in front of us. Seeing none. Was there any questions for staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Kelley, am I correct in my remembering -- my memory of the City's agriculture districts that these lots -- these plats would allow a second home on these; is that correct?

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. Pursuant to a conditional-use permit.

MR. MACMANN: All right. And that's conditional-use. That gets me to where I was headed on the -- and if you don't know this, because I can't remember -- I'm sorry -- of right-of-ways. Is there a curb cut limitation on these lots?

MR. KELLEY: I -- I -- yeah. I think you're correct. I don't think they would allow a private drive on this. I believe it's a neighborhood collector, if you're referring to North Oakland Gravel Drive.

MR. MACMANN: Right. So that would be -- each of these lots would have one drive though; do we know? I don't know the answer to this question because we don't deal with Ag very often. I'm trying to inform myself for now and in the future.

MR. KELLEY: I'm not certain. Pat, can you --

MR. ZENNER: I cannot recall, Mr. MacMann, as it related to the platting.

MR. MACMANN: Well, the reason I ask this question is having grown up and lived in areas that have these style of farmettes, as we're calling them here, the second home usually means a -- or can mean a second driveway, and the use of animals might even mean a third driveway, you know, to service a barn or bring animals in and out. Sometimes it's just one, but that's a very common thing with this type of use.

MR. ZENNER: Given that North Oakland Gravel in this particular location, if I'm not incorrect, is actually a county-maintained road.

MR. MACMANN: I think that is correct, yes.

MR. ZENNER: All driveway encroachment permitting would be subject to their requirements, not necessarily the City's. So I would have to defer to the Boone County resource management staff, and I don't know their regulations.

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Kelley, do we have a -- and I did not mean to cut you off. I'm sorry. Do we have any annexation triggers, like right in this area; do we know?

MR. ZENNER: No. This property was annexed as -- as indicated, back in 2007.

MR. MACMANN: Are any of these lots, like, up to the right we don't have anything? We have nothing coming in right away up here. Right?

MR. KELLEY: Oh, no. No. Not at all.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. I just -- I'm looking out for CATSO, like we just discussed. All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Kelley and Mr. Zenner. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? I just had one clarification following up on Mr. MacMann's question about an additional unit. Did -- was it a conditional-use permit, just checking? I'm seeing that two contiguous residential lots may be created in this district. The creation of an additional lot requires rezoning to R-1 and approval of a subdivision?

MR. KELLEY: In the --

MS. LOE: They can do two with the A, and if they wanted to do more than that, then that would have to go to R-1? But is there a conditional-use? I thought two houses were allowed in A.

MR. KELLEY: I believe you could have two on A, but the second one would require with conditional. And I was looking at the table, but --

MR. ZENNER: So a second -- a second primary dwelling unit on an Ag lot is permitted. That is -- that's permitted in the Ag and generally it would be associated potentially with a farmhand or somebody else. If you want to do -- if you wanted to divide the property into more than two residential lots in the Ag zoning district, we look at that

as a residential -- the third lot would constitute a residential subdivision further cutting away at the integrity of larger acreage parcels that facilitate farming. So, you know, you may take a five-acre tract of land. The minimum land requirement for A is two and a half to grow and -- to grow or handle animals, livestock, and crops. So you could take that five acre, divide it into two. We would allow you to do that. But if you want to take that, then five acres and divide it into three, you've got to rezone to a -- to an R-1 subdivision in order to do it because you're whittling down the agricultural nature of the A district too far at that point.

MS. LOE: Right. Here it says 2.5 acres is the minimum lot for an A district, only one principal dwelling and one second principal dwelling allowed on each lot, so yeah. Just to be clear.

Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a point of clarity. That second primary, as it's listed in there - - that's an odd way to list that -- that does not require a replat. That's a by-right action for that. Right?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct.

MS. LOE: Correct.

MR. MACMANN: All right.

MS. LOE: All right.

MR. MACMANN: Mother-in-laws is who goes there, Pat.

MR. ZENNER: Topic for another discussion.

MS. LOE: Principal dwelling. Principal dwelling. Any additional questions? I see none. We will open up the floor for public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. LOE: If anyone has any comments they would like to provide on this case, please come up to the podium and provide your name and address for the record.

MR. BUTCHER: I'm David Butcher; I'm with Crockett Engineering. I'm not going to approach the podium because -- (inaudible).

MS. LOE: We need you in the microphone, I'm afraid.

MR. BUTCHER: All right. I'll step up here a little closer. I just don't want to have to disinfect everything. Are we good?

MS. LOE: A little bit closer.

MR. BUTCHER: All right. I'll do it. All right. So I'm here on behalf of T-Vine. I'm David Butcher; I'm the land surveyor that's working on this. The purpose of our request tonight is really so that this property, this ten-acre parcel would compete in the world with the other ten-acre parcels out there. These -- these parcels are not allowed to have a

horse at this time. They've had lots of people with interest that would like to have horses on these properties, but since we can't have the horses, they've decided they'd walk away from it and they go somewhere in the county. So because this is a county-maintained road, because it's basically nestled in the county, we would like to downzone it so that we can accommodate that. I don't know anything about the second dwelling. I don't think that's part of the request. I understand that would come with it, but that's not the intent for what we're trying to accomplish. So I'm here if you have any questions.

MS. LOE: Any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you. I think a little bit closer, and your name and address for the record, please.

MR. AWAZU: My name is Yuval Awazu; I'm at 6120 North Oakland Gravel Road, which is that triangle on the right side of the property there. And I have no problem with, you know, horses being there, but if -- you know, it would be great if there's a way to limit it to horses. I mean, if it was, like, hogs or, you know, other animals, especially that being a very low floodplain area, I could see, like, you know, waste going into the -- the Bear Creek there that you wouldn't want, you know. So, I guess, that's the only thing I would be concerned with. I mean, you know, I'd love to have horses there. I don't care, you know.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Questions for this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If I may, I'd like to redirect for you. Mr. Zenner, it's my recollection in Chapter 5 that hogs are not permitted, like meat production-type stuff?

MR. ZENNER: I mean, the raising or care of livestock, which a hog would be considered livestock, I can't speak to the fact if they are or they aren't. We do have regulations, though, that do deal with density, the number of animals, placement of features such as manure piles and things of that nature which are handled by our Environmental Health staff, not ours. So if somebody came in and was going to be seeking to do some type of animal operation, growing -- just not grazing horses, they're likely going to need to go through another level of review as it relates to that from the health side. So I think the concerns that you -- you may have as it relates to the environmental impacts, those are addressed through other regulatory measures.

MR. AWAZU: So if someone wanted, like, five hogs or something there?

MR. ZENNER: Based on, I think, the acreage calculations we were looking at, it's how many acres per horse?

MR. KELLEY: I think it's a half-acre per horse, which is -- yeah. So I think it would be limited to 42 if it was utilizing this entire acreage, for both ten-acre sites or eleven-acre sites.

MR. ZENNER: However, to Mr. MacMann's point, there may other regulatory

provisions in play that I'm not familiar with that would limit other types of livestock -- chickens and things of that nature for hatcheries or something along that. Those actually, when you're looking at animal production facilities that you may be doing slaughtering or things of that nature on the property, that is not permitted in the Ag district. That is actually more of an industrial use.

MR. KELLEY: To add on to what Mr. Zenner is saying, concerning, like, concentrating feeding operations, that's something that the Missouri Department of Natural Resources has regulations for. Specifically, like, in terms of siting near houses, schools, that type of thing, it's, like, a minimum distance of property letters. And then in addition to that, they also look at floodplain as a consideration, so they're kind of taking into fact the drainage and kind of the stuff that you're mentioning, as well.

MR. AWAZU: So, but if someone wanted to have let's say the same amount of hogs that you could have horses, that would be allowable?

MR. KELLEY: From my understanding, yes.

MR. AWAZU: Horses I'm cool with, but --

MR. ZENNER: Mr. MacMann.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I just -- to let you know. I would -- sir, I would -- thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Mr. Zenner. I would suggest that you follow up specifically with the City -- which department is that, Pat?

MR. ZENNER: Environmental Health.

MR. MACMANN: Check with Environmental Health. They are not -- my understanding is that meat production like that is not allowed, but I strongly -- I don't have it in front of me and it's been a while since I've read it. I would strongly suggest that you follow up with them about your concerns to animal ratios. Animal ratios are usually based upon you said -- he said 42 horses on this lot. Mr. -- yeah. Horses are bigger than hogs, so you can divide by weight type thing. That's usually how devisors go. But, again, I would check with -- with our folks at the relevant office to get your questions -- but I'm almost positive, and I cannot speak with them exactly, but they cannot have a meat production operation there. That's a whole -- it's industrial use, they've got to get it rezoned and get permitted and the whole nine yards. I appreciate your concern because this -- a lot of the agricultural property in the City is not used for anything, maybe occasional grazing. And I was asking questions and the Chair was asking questions, so, like, well, we should really kind of inform ourselves on this a little bit because we don't deal with it very often. But thanks for coming up.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any more speakers on this case?

MS. DOKKEN: Dee Dokken, 804 Again Street. And I'm -- this is just a comment. Any time, as someone who follows the confined animal feeding and DNR, anyone who states as reassurance that DNR is controlling this or regulating this, it is super lax. There is no inspections. The Clean Water Commission is -- I mean, there was just a ruling today or yesterday, I think, that it's okay for them just to put industry in there. So I -- I just think we should be cautious saying DNR has got it covered because that's not really the case.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Dokken. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If I may. Thank you, Ms. Dokken. The reason I brought up going to the relevant City organization, because I've lived in rural Missouri and I have friends who still live near these places. The county's hands are tied, for sure. I think you have more protections in the cities. But, again, I would suggest you follow up with the City about how all that zoning goes. I'm almost positive they have to either get a conditional-use permit and a whole -- maybe even rezoning to have animal production there. Personal use is one thing. You can raise a hog. We can raise chickens here in town. But for sale, that's a whole different -- and a valid concern.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

MS. LOE: You need to --

MR. MACMANN: I don't know the answer to that question, sir. I'm sorry. It's -- I have read these regulations. It's not our bailiwick, so to speak. I'm just -- I'm giving the information that I can recall right now.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none, we're going to close public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. LOE: Commission, discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Well, I was going to ask if the representative of Crockett Engineering could kind of quiet some fears or give some -- you know, kind of address anything that's been addressed so far?

MR. BUTCHER: A rebuttal; is that what you're meaning?

MR. STANTON: Yeah. Something to tell me.

MS. LOE: We can open up public speaking again, yes.

MR. STANTON: I'm sorry. I'll try to keep --

MS. LOE: No, you didn't. You didn't.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING REOPENED**

MR. BUTCHER: So your rebuttal is under public speaking; okay. Perfect.

MS. LOE: Yes. And we need your name and address again.

MR. BUTCHER: David Butcher, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong, Building 1. With regards to the hog production, I will say that Boone County is a pretty large area and we've got other places that will be better suited for that type of production. These properties are not going to be cheap enough for someone to want to raise hogs on them. I would highly suspect that horse farming is probably the -- what's going to pull this wagon down the road. So not that you couldn't -- I understand his concerns and I really -- I respect that. I live out in rural Boone County, myself, and you always worry that the person next door is going to do that. I will say there are other places right there nearby him that don't have as many protections as what the City of Columbia would offer him because of the county that's nearby -- county property that's nearby. So I would say that that's probably a -- out in the weeds a little bit worried about these hogs, but I -- I do understand his concerns. It could be something else that could be as nefarious. That's all I got.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. BUTCHER: You're welcome.

MS. LOE: Any additional public comment? I see none. We'll close public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. LOE: Commission, discussion? Mr. Zenner? If I may, so Mr. Smith brought up the Code for me to look at. Livestock does include hogs, goats, and a variety of other animals inclusive of horses. A suggestion for the applicant to take back -- the applicant's representative to take back to the applicant and the neighbor to potentially discuss with the property owner would be to establish as part of the transfer of the property a restrictive covenant that just indicates that they're not going to allow the raising of livestock and list the animals that may be those that are not desired. If horses is all they want, it could be handled through a restrictive covenant to the property, which is not our bailiwick, but would get the property owner adjoining possibly some protection that he is desiring by bringing the comment up to the Commission here this evening. But as Mr. Kelley has pointed out, the agricultural designation for the property fits into the character of that area, and part of our land use assessment and the appropriateness of zoning goes to look at that. It does reduce the intensity of development on the property also, which is another contributing factor as to why the zoning classification is appropriate. There are other methods outside of the zoning, however, that could control the use of the property for undesirable animals.

MS. LOE: Comments? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: How about a motion? In the Tuscany Estates Zoning Map



Amendment Case 116-2020, I move to approve the zoning map amendment from R-1 to A.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Rushing. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. I'm not sure if it's discussion on that motion that I'm -- I apologize. So the covenant that you mentioned -- or restricting the use to a specific animal, that's not part of this motion? This is just straight --

MS. LOE: No. That would be a deed restriction.

MS. CARROLL: Right. And we wouldn't be able to do that here? That's something they would do --

MS. LOE: That would be between the parties or it would be a private agreement.

MS. CARROLL: Exactly. I share the concern about the hogs. There's been fairly numerous recent news items regarding DNR and their ability to respond recently. And I'm not sure if all animal operations would be appropriate for this. I do support Ag use with horses, but I -- I wouldn't feel comfortable without any restriction for the types of animals at this point voting yes on this. I view it very much like I would view should we allow a conditional use across the school that even though the applicant doesn't plan to have a bar, would allow a bar, I view that the same. Even though the applicant doesn't plan to have a bar, would allow a bar, I view that the same. Even though this applicant may not plan to have hog farms, that's included on the list, and this goes with the property, so we cannot control what the use would be in perpetuity if we apply this. And that would be my reason against supporting this at this exact juncture.

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner or Mr. Kelley, are we aware if there's any restrictions from having livestock operations -- I'm looking at the more dense residential to the west of the properties. So --

MR. ZENNER: County R-S zoned land, so, no.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: The property immediately to the north, which is the Horse Fair Farms, it's R-S, I believe, as well. So R-S district does -- I apologize. The R-S district does allow agricultural use in the county. The subdivision platted to the west is -- is obviously a platted subdivision. Immediately to the north, it's very possible that they could have probably livestock, but I don't know what the County's regulations are in relationship to that. What I can tell you is a feeding operation of any nature within the City is not considered a -- when you may have feeding or confined operations would

probably not be considered an agricultural use, especially if you had any type of preparation -- meat preparation or anything along those lines. That is industrial in nature. A private restrictive covenant is a way of ensuring, at least between the property owners, that the -- the objectionable uses is addressed. It was offered as an -- as an alternative or a suggestion to the applicant to take back to his client and for the property owner adjacent to be able to resolve these matters in a civil way as property owner to property owner. I understand the position that Ms. Carroll has, and others may share that. An agricultural district is meant for environments where it is low density and that this use would generally be considered consistent with the comprehensive plan, so hence our analysis and our recommendation of approval.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions or comments? All right. Ms. Burns, may we have roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MS. BURNS: Seven to one -- six to one, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

**In the matter of Tuscany Estates Zoning Map Amendment Case 116-2020, move to approve the zoning map amendment from R-1 to A.**

**Yes:** 6 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton and MacMann

**No:** 1 - Carroll

**Recused:** 1 - Toohey

**Case # 121-2020**

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of On the 9th, LLC and Nash Investments (owners), for approval of a major amendment to the On The Ninth at Old Hawthorne PD Plan located on property zoned PD (Planned Development) to revise the Statement of Intent and reduce the distance between dwelling units from 16 feet to 12 feet. The 5.68-acre property is located on the east side of Old Hawthorne Drive West, approximately 1,300 feet north of Route WW.

MS. LOE: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the major amendment to the On the Ninth PD plan and the revised Statement of Intent.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Are there any -- oh. Before we move to questions, I would like to ask Commissioners if there is anyone who has had any ex parte related to this case to please disclose that now so we all have the same information in front of us. Seeing none. Is there any questions for staff? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I notice that the intent is to preserve 40 percent in green space.

And the developed portion and including the new three units; is that correct?

MR. SMITH: Correct.

MS. RUSHING: Occupying a lot of concrete. Is there going to be substantial green space in the undeveloped area?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. You can see, I think, in the northern portion, there's a -- there's a fairly substantial green space.

MS. RUSHING: Yeah. There's a little, tiny part, and then -

MR. SMITH: Yeah. And --

MS. RUSHING: But it looks like the green space along the east side is not on this property.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MS. RUSHING: So, again, you know, that little triangle up there doesn't look like 40 percent.

MR. SMITH: Well, we have the numbers on here, so I can double-check on what they're showing as open space calculation, because I think I cut that off on ours.

MS. RUSHING: Yeah. What you've shown shows their old plan on that -- the semicircle area.

MR. SMITH: Right.

MS. RUSHING: My understanding, that's now five single-family lots?

MR. SMITH: Correct.

MS. RUSHING: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: In the middle there, in the interior bunker loop. And so the plan here on the left, which I didn't capture in the screen shot, and my apologies, is pervious surface would still be about 57 percent. And we do have to do some estimations because we don't have a specific footprint for the single-family, but we use a common number to kind of come up with that. But they, according to those calculations, they're well within the 40 percent minimum of open space.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions, Ms. Rushing? Any additional questions? Mr. Smith, I had -- this could be housekeeping, but I was wondering about the 28th unit.

MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

MS. LOE: The 28th unit?

MR. SMITH: Twenty-eighth unit.

MS. LOE: Like the third man. Where did it go? So the original plan, we had a four-plex or four?

MR. SMITH: Yes. Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: And we went to three, so one unit moved somewhere?

MR. SMITH: Correct.

MS. LOE: Where?

MR. SMITH: They -- well, they eliminated it. Is it still captured on the plan?

MS. LOE: So it's still captured in the density calculations.

MR. SMITH: Okay. That was probably an oversight.

MS. LOE: So it's for 27 units now? All right.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh. Yeah. One unit was eliminated, so we'd have to look at that and get that updated, but we could probably do that.

MS. LOE: If there's no additional questions for staff, we'll open up the floor to public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. LOE: Please give your name and address for the record.

MR. BUTCHER: I'm David Butcher with Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I do have a question about our density. We may have had a four-plex in that D, and now we have five single-family lots, taking that one unit from across the street into that D instead of -- because, originally, that had a four-plex on it, I believe.

MR. SMITH: It had two four-plexes.

MR. ZENNER: Two four-plexes.

MR. BUTCHER: Oh, did it?

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. BUTCHER: So we've already reduced it once and -- all right. Then that's just an error or oversight. We'll get it fixed.

MS. RUSHING: You're saying you're -- the two four-plexes that it is showing are the ones that you're planning to build?

MR. BUTCHER: No. Everything is already built out on this property with the exception of the darkened highlighted three-plex that's at the southwest corner, and then the single-family lots that have already been platted. Those single-family lots will end up with a house on them.

MS. RUSHING: Okay. So they'll each have a single house?

MR. BUTCHER: Yes. In the -- in the circle in the D shaped --

MS. RUSHING: So what four-plex are you talking about?

MR. BUTCHER: Originally, the plan prior to this one -

MS. RUSHING: Oh, right. Right.

MR. BUTCHER: -- we only had four-plexes in that.

MS. RUSHING: Right. Right.

MR. BUTCHER: So we've reduced that so that it's just those single-family homes.

MS. RUSHING: Correct. Okay.

MR. BUTCHER: Anyway, this is a housekeeping matter really. Our objective is just to reduce that to -- to match the normal single-family residential style. And it was an oversight on my part that we had that in the -- in the regulation on the statement of intent from originally, so the objective is just to allow us to build a little -- those homes in there like anyone else would on the rest of the single-family lots. Is that clear? I'm kind of juggling a little bit in my verbiage here.

MS. LOE: Are there any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you. Are there any other speakers on this case? Seeing none, we will close public comments.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. LOE: Commissioner, discussion? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: A housekeeping notice here. I'd like to thank the Chair for the Graham Greene reference. I really appreciate that. Thank you.

MS. LOE: So the real issue is the setbacks. Correct. All right. If there's no further discussion, Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: All right. In the -- I'll make a motion. In the case of 121-2020, On-the-Ninth PD Plan amendment, I move to approve.

MS. BURNS: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Burns. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick and more seriously this time. I just -- a heads up. In the future, I will be generally supportive of anything that reduces lot size. Just FYI. Thanks.

MS. LOE: Any additional comments? Seeing none. Ms. Burns, may we have roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. That closes our cases for the evening.

**In the case of 121-2020, On-the-Ninth PD Plan amendment, move to approve.**

**Yes:** 8 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, MacMann and Carroll

**VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

MS. LOE: Any additional public comments? Seeing none.

**VII. STAFF COMMENTS**

MR. ZENNER: As you can see, and as Ms. Burns provided a -- a farewell to Mr. Rusty Strodtman, our most current former Planning Commissioner, on behalf of staff, I would like to acknowledge publicly this evening, not knowing what Council's action is going to be on Monday of this week, our heartfelt appreciation for his years of service, his leadership as chairman, and his being on board with us on a number of our more challenging topics that we have covered over the years. He will be a sorely missed addition to our fold. However, we do have a new Commissioner who will be beginning on July 9th with us. I cannot pronounce her middle name is Sharon Jones, but she goes by a different -- a middle name and a last name, so it's a -- it's not hyphenated, either. So we will get to meet Sharon at our next meeting. I will just call her Sharon for today, and I have reached out to her already and she is familiarizing herself with our materials, so when she does show up for our work session, be gentle. And we will bring her into the fold as quickly as we can with all of our additional topics. But again, it is with my greatest appreciation for Mr. Strodtman's service and we will definitely wish him the best and he moves on back into private life. As far as what we have coming up, we do have a meeting on July 9th, and that will occur at 5:30 in our regular location. Then also be followed by a regular -- our regular work session at 5:30 with our regular meeting at 7:30 [sic] here. You will have meal service. There is one item on the agenda. It is a rezoning to planned district which is not familiar. We normally are going in the opposite direction. This is a piece of property off of Green Meadows that is immediately adjacent to the Rock Bridge Christian Church. It is the triangular piece that is out on the point between Green Meadows Circle and Green Meadows. They are looking at a smaller lot, single-family detached, if I recall correctly, product in the PD utilizing more of a common driveway system, and Mr. Palmer will be providing the staff report for that. There was an additional item on our agenda that was withdrawn at this point to allow for some additional review. So we would have had one additional item, so this should be a relatively, I'd say, quick meeting. It depends on how well the public has been reached out to prior to coming for public hearing. The Greenbriar neighborhood, as well as some of the other residential neighborhoods in this particular area are generally very active. There has been concern expressed with prior planned district proposals on this site which were not residential that generated quite significant public engagement. So just to familiarize yourself with where this particular property is located, if you can't understand from my description, Green

Meadows Circle to the north, and then Green Meadows Drive on the south, and this is probably less than a quarter of a mile from Murray's, so everybody knows where Murray's is. But that is your only item on the agenda. As we discussed during work session this evening, our next work session on July 9th will be a continuation of the discussion we had this evening as it relates to the comprehensive plan update and how we are going to be dealing with and refining our survey instruments that we discussed generally this evening. So if you will, please do not discard your work session materials you received. We will not be reproducing them for you, and we may supplement it with amended sheets, but given the fact that it's a lot of color and we would like you to just maybe mark it up and come with your notes and then hand them over to us so we can figure out what you actually truly had to say about our work, as well as analyze your handwriting. But, nonetheless, we would like to -- we would like you to keep that to save us a little bit of money. We are trying to potentially resolve our issue with laptops for the work sessions - or not work sessions, but for this meeting. With the low volume of cases that we have been bringing forward to you, producing the printed packet has not been an issue. But if you are not wanting it, if you are going to bring your own laptop and connect to the -- to the guest Wi-Fi, I'd greatly appreciate being notified of that in advance so I do not have to produce the additional packets. Obviously, you personally have all probably been affected by Covid and the pandemic. The City has been, as well, and, therefore, our resources are becoming tighter and tighter. And if we can reduce expenditures in having to copy packets for you, we'd greatly appreciate that if -- if at all possible. But we do realize you're accustomed to seeing stuff in front of you on a laptop, hence the reason why we have produced the packets for you up to this point. But if you will bring your own laptops, you're more than welcome to, or if you need a printed packet, please just let me know. If there are any of the Commissioners that are going to be taking breaks for our summer months as we are getting to the summer season of vacations, please let Ms. Loe and I know so we can properly plan for that in the way of quorum. If not, I appreciate your attendance and your continued support of what we do here with the City, and for its citizens. With that, that's all I have to say for this evening.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

## **VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

MS. LOE: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Go ahead.

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick, a housekeeping point. I would like to thank Commissioner Russell for mentioning something. She said she was having a hard time

hearing me in the -- in the work session. And I will speak up. I just wanted to let you know the folks on the other end -- of course, Pat, I can hear fine. But the other staff members who speak in a more normative tone, I was having difficulty hearing them. I just wasn't cognizant -- I'm always afraid I'm speaking too loudly, so thank you for saying something. I'll try to stand up or project more or something.

MS. LOE: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to address our current City environment and the importance of, you know, we don't really address police brutality or anything directly in this Commission, but the decisions that we do make concerning land use and neighborhood protections and all that will be part of the solution. So as we go through cases, especially when it deals with, you know, the decisions that we make, I ask my Commission to help us with the bigger picture. These young folks that are here, I wore this shirt -- It's BAG CHASERS. This a group of young men that knew each other all their lives. They were out in protests and rallies, and they started a business. And they felt like this was their solution to help bring together their -- their fellow community members and help their community. So I'm supporting them and I need you guys support in helping heal some things, you know. I've addressed a lot of issues, especially when we were talking about the weed ordinances and security and all of that. I try not to cry about it, but this is reality for me all the time. And I just want you to -- you know, we don't have to agree all the time. Just listen when I say things that address my community directly. It's real. If you don't know it's real by now, these young people out here will let you know how real it will be. And when it comes to this comprehensive plan that we're going to go, and we're going to have -- we're going to create a progress report on, we had a very good discussion in work session. I will be encouraging my fellow neighbors and the community to get more involved because this is the plan on how we're going to shape the City. And then a lot more things will be coming to light and people will become more involved, and they will have less patience. And it's not our fault, per se, the process, so we need to do our thing in our little groups and our peer groups to allow people to understand what we do on this side and how it affects them directly and how we can help them become more informed, more involved in City policy, land use. A lot of these youngsters and a lot of old people don't really realize how land use and land-use policy affects policing, neighborhood development. And it's very surprising your zip code may determine your future. But we need to think and be cognizant of that as we make land-use policies in the future, and hopefully we can be a part of the solution and not part of the problem. Thank you for your time.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. And just to amend -- not amend but add to that. One of the things I've been hearing on the street or being -- is becoming active or getting



the vote out, you know, starting to, and showing up here in the Council room. But I have to admit my thought also went to participating. So we're all volunteers and we need more people volunteering to see -- we're stronger together, so -- any additional comments?

**IX. NEXT MEETING DATE - July 9, 2020 @ 7:00 pm (tentative)**

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

MS. LOE: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If we do not -- I don't want to cut anybody off. If there are no further comments, I have a motion. I move to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. We're adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.)

(Off the record.)

**Approved Adjournment**