



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 8, 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 October 8th, 2020 Planning and Zoning Meeting together.

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

MS. CARROLL: We have eight Commissioners; we have a quorum.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

Present: 8 - Tootie Burns, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Lee Russell, Anthony Stanton, Brian Toohey, Valerie Carroll and Sharon Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - Michael MacMann

II. INTRODUCTIONS

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. RUSSELL: I move to approve that agenda.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Ms. Russell, second by Mr. Stanton. Thumbs up on approval of the agenda?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: It looks unanimous.

Approved Agenda

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approved Minutes

September 24, 2020 Regular Meeting

MS. LOE: Everyone should have gotten a copy of the September 24th, 2020 regular meeting minutes. Were there any adjustments or changes to those minutes? Seeing none.

MR. STANTON: I move to approve.

MS. RUSSELL: Second

MS. LOE: Moved by Mr. Stanton, seconded by Ms. Russell. I'll take a thumbs up approval on the minutes.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: It's unanimous. Thank you.

Motion to approve minutes as submitted

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 128-2020

A request by Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Commerce Bank & Broadfield Properties, LLC (owners), seeking to rezone approximately 5.97 acres of property from PD (Planned Development) to M-C (Mixed Use- Corridor) and 5.38 acres from PD to M-N (Mixed Use- Neighborhood). The property is generally located northeast of the traffic circle at E. Highway WW and Rolling Hills Road with frontage on both sides of Pergola Drive.

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

Staff report was given by Ms. Rachel Bacon of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning from PD to M-N and M-C as requested.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Bacon. Before we move on to staff 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. Are there any questions for staff? None. Ms. Bacon, I have one quick question. I actually was thinking that the neighbors on Morning Dove Lane -- Drive might be impacted a little bit more, while the Bower Lane and Trellis Lane neighbors are closer. That where the six-story building was permitted, and we're going from six story to one story -- three -- three story?

MS. BACON: It would be three under 35 --

MS. LOE: So it's reducing the height next to them --

MS. BACON: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: -- whereas the Morning Dove Drive, that's closer to where the M-C would be allowed. Was there any response?

MS. BACON: So if you see on the aerial, it's pretty vacant right there.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MS. BACON: So I think that might have been part of that, and -- and I don't disagree that they would also be directly affected by this request, as well.

MS. LOE: But that's the other thing I was looking at. Those lots have not yet been built, so anyone moving there, the M-C would be there prior to them being built. All right. If there's no more questions, we will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If you can give your name and address for the record.

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. My name is Jay Gebhardt; I'm a civil engineer with A Civil Group, and basically, I'm here to answer any questions you might have of the applicant.

MS. LOE: Are there any questions for Mr. Gebhardt? I see none. Thank you. Any additional speakers on this case? Seeing none, we will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commissioner discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: If the Commission doesn't have any other questions, I would like to entertain a motion. As it relates to Case 128-2020, Old Hawthorne commercial rezoning, I move to rezone from PD to M-N -- M-N and M-C as requested.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Russell. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none. Ms. Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: We have eight votes in the affirmative. The motion carries.

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

Move to rezone Old Hawthorne commercial (Case 128-2020), from PD to M-N and M-C as requested

Yes: 8 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, Carroll and Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - MacMann

Case # 176-2020

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of OTA Properties, LLC (contract purchasers), for approval of a PD plan on property located on the east side of Colony Drive approximately 400 feet south of Chapel Hill Road. The PD plan will include one structure, to house a 'school-related' use, and an associated play yard to the rear (east) of the lot.

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

Staff report was given by Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department.

Staff recommends approval of the requested major amendment to, "The Colonies Plat 5-E

C-P Plan."

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Before we move to Commissioner -- or questions for staff, 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 this case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? I see none. Good job, Mr. Palmer. All right. We will move on to public comments

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: Would anyone like to make any public comments on this case? Seeing none. We will close public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: If my fellow Commissioners don't have any additional questions, I would like to entertain a motion.

MS. LOE: Please.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 176-2020, I move to approve the PD plan for Lot 5-E for the Colonies.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

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

MS. CARROLL: I'll provide a brief comment. We have a fairly advanced shortage of daycare opportunities in the city. I am excited about this proposal and I plan to approve it.

MS. LOE: Any additional discussion on the motion? Seeing none, may we have a roll call, please, Ms. Carroll.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr.

Stanton,

Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll,

Ms. Loe. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: The motion is carried eight votes to zero.

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

As it relates to Case 176-2020, move to approve the PD plan for Lot 5-E for the Colonies

Yes: 8 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, Carroll and Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - MacMann

Case # 184-2020

A request by Anderson Engineering (agent), on behalf of Endeavor Center, LLC (owner), for approval of a major amendment to the Discovery Park Plat 5, Lot 501 PD plan to resubdivide the lot, to add two floors onto Building B for residential uses, to obtain a design adjustment to Sections 29-5.1(f)(3) a to allow a new lot line through a structure, and to obtain a design exception to Section 29-4.6 relating to entry door orientation. The site is currently located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Nocona Parkway and Endeavor Avenue.

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 requested PD plan major amendment to be known as Discovery Park Plat 5, Lot 501 PD Plan Major Amendment #1, the associated design adjustment for a structure over a lot line, and the associated design exception to Section 29-4.6.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Before we move on to questions for staff, 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 this case in front of us. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Yeah. After kind of looking at this a little deeper. The company I'm associated with, we do a lot of business out here. I think I need to recuse myself.

MS. LOE: All right. Thank you. Any additional comments? Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Mr. --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry.

MS. LOE: Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: You looked away from me right as I was raising my hand. I don't know if this is a question for staff or more of a comment, but I assume that when the UDC allows for shared parking allotments, they -- or not they, because the UDC isn't a person -- but the assumptions is people aren't home all day every day. So when they're gone, it's used for commercial, and when they're -- when the businesses are shut down, it's used for residential. Is that the assumption that we're working on?

MR. SMITH: Correct. Yes. So that -- that operates under the assumption, like you said, that different users are going to have different peak times for parking. And so when residential uses are most needed, which is usually in the evening when they're coming home from work and overnight, commercial businesses are closing, and so the parking then becomes available. So you have a kind of this overlap of a peak time of when that parking would be utilized, and so that allows you to kind of -- kind of take credit a little bit

for some of that -- the parking that the other use may actually be providing, so if that makes sense.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If they were doing -- they're adding two floors. Correct?

MR. SMITH: Correct. Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If they were adding one floor, which would be 22 units, would they need the adjustment below the minimum?

MR. SMITH: Probably not. I think with the adjustment, they -- I think the parking they have on site is 83 spaces, and I think with the adjustment, they actually -- their minimum required is 72, if I -- I don't have the numbers right in front of me, but they were -- they were well under the minimum. So I think if they reduced a whole floor, they may get by without having to use the -- the reduction factor. And that -- it also doesn't take into account, they can reduce the minimum number of parking spaces by providing bike parking, and I don't think that was actually shown on the plan, but that's something they can also -- you know, is also available to them, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure. I'm just -- I think that we're entering a brave new world where those assumptions may not still exist or be accurate.

MR. SMITH: Well, it's -- it's something -- I don't know if we would utilize those quite frequently. I think it's something we're kind of encouraged to see somebody taking advantage of those because they were intentionally placed into the UDC to -- to kind of address, you know, the overbuilt parking environment. And so, hopefully, if -- if we do get negative feedback on that, that's something we'll monitor, and maybe it needs to be adjusted in the future, but we're kind of -- I think kind of encouraged to see how it's going to play out.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think that we're seeing more and more people having to work from home, and so they're probably not going to be gone eight hours a day.

MR. SMITH: Fair enough.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? Mr. Smith, I was wondering, do you have the original approved plat that you could put up?

MR. SMITH: The original approved -- approved plat or PD plan? Well, the answer is the same. No, I don't have either one.

MS. LOE: PD Plan. Okay.

MR. SMITH: No. Not in here, and I apologize. Was there something specific you were looking for on it?

MS. LOE: Yes. So maybe you can go back to the one -- the amended one that you do have. So in your report, you commented that staff supports the exception for entry door orientation because of the advantages that the design provides. Can you just

elaborate on that a little bit more?

MR. SMITH: I apologize. I don't remember the exact phrase. I do remember I think we were discussing --

MS. LOE: No. And I'm paraphrasing.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MS. LOE: There was a sentence in there saying that this -- because of other attributes of this, that -- but it didn't go on to spell those out, so I made a note to ask you.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I think the -- the advantage there would be with the parking interior, that is an aesthetic benefit, and I think we've seen this before that when you have the parking on the interior, you -- you -- there is that desire to also have access from where you have your parking at, and I think that was kind of articulated by the applicant during our discussions originally. And so that -- that does provide you to provide that direct access from the parking area into the building versus someone who parks there, if the access is on the street, now they have to walk all the way around the building. So it's -- I don't want to say there's a -- a bit of Catch 22 thereon on where you place your parking, but it does somewhat, I think, make it difficult to hide that parking from the street frontage which is -- is a design feature that -- that I think many commercial designers would want to do, and I think, in general, is a design we would like to see more going forward. But then again, you run into that problem where they do then want the access from the interior of site, not -- not the exterior from the site. But that -- that would be one of the advantages. I think where I was headed with that was with the -- the additional walkway in between the two buildings, we thought that was going to provide enough of that pedestrian connectivity for the individuals walking down the public sidewalk to safely and kind of efficiently access to the front of the building without having to walk down a -- a drive aisle or through the parking lot. So it gave them still that -- that pedestrian access that's separated from -- from the drive area, but, again, it does -- it doesn't quite meet the standard for having a door on the street side.

MS. LOE: The access between the buildings?

MR. SMITH: Right.

MS. LOE: So the reason I asked for the original PD plan is because that access was about twice as wide, the distance between the buildings in the original plan. So when they came back with the amendment, I wasn't too happy that it had gotten narrower, but we had approved it previously. But given that that's a dog yard in there for the vet, it does seem a little bit tight to me that you're bringing people in right past the veterinary dog yard. So you're right, it still went through the second time. Now that we've added a mixed use component that ostensibly would have a separate entrance anyway, I

have to admit I don't support the exception any longer because I'm not sure I fully support all the parking needing to be one side of the building, but especially in the report which says that most of the traffic for this building will be pedestrian traffic coming from the neighborhood and that this is a model that they want to replicate on other corners. I have some real doubts about putting multiple-story buildings with no active entrances on the street and putting residential entrances into parking lots. So I was hoping that the staff would have some stronger advantages about why those entrances could be turned around for -- for a residential entrance. We've gone from just commercial to now 44 units are going to be coming and going from there, especially when you have that 25-foot setback off the street. I mean, I'm assuming that's a parkway that's going to have some landscaping and could potentially be a multi-modal space that could be engaging. But if you don't have eyes on the street, if you don't have some activity generated along that, it may lose some safety factors or -- I just think we could be pushing that. That entrance on the street was a big thing in our Code, so I'm not going to give that one up lightly on this one, I don't think. All right. Any other questions for staff?

MS. CARROLL: I'll save it for comments.

MS. LOE: In that case, we'll open it up -- floor up to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If anyone has any public comment, please give your name and address for the record.

MR. WOOTEN: Good evening. Tom Wooten with Anderson Engineering; our office is at 4240 Phillips Farm Road in Columbia, and I can answer any questions you have.

MS. LOE: Are there any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you.

MR. WOOTEN: Thank you.

MS. LOE: No other speakers? We'll close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commissioner discussion? Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. I was a bit concerned about the assumption also that the majority of the traffic comes from the neighborhoods once residential is added. There are three major employers that are just across 63 from there. There's a protected sidewalk walkway from the overpass. It's about a 15-minute walk to that area. I happen to work over there. We have a number of new employees that have suggested they would be looking for a walkable place to live, and have a hard time finding something that meets their needs. I support the mixed use. I think that's a benefit. I am uncertain whether or not an added walkway makes it walkable, but I do think it's an amenity for the area.

MS. LOE: Any additional comments? Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. I obviously was not on the Commission in January. I feel pretty strongly that if you want safe, walkable, vibrant streets, you need entrances from those streets. And I'm -- I'm disturbed that we are now drastically increasing the number of people coming and going and you've basically got -- I know there will be windows and stuff, but blank walls on two sides of this corner. And I'm also really concerned, I mean, up until six months ago, the UDC was appropriately assuming that people leave and go to work and then come home at night. I don't think we can assume that anymore. More and more employers are going permanently to remote work. I -- I just -- I think this is too many people without appropriate access. And while I want there to be more mixed use in Columbia, the whole reason we have planned development is so we can make these judgment calls.

MS. LOE: Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I'm going to go ahead and make a motion, if nobody has any other comments. I move to approve - on Case 184-2020, I move to approve the requested PD plan major amendment to be known as Discovery Park Plat 5, Lot 501 PD Plan Major Amendment Number 1, the associated design adjustment for the structure over a lot line, and the associated design exception to Section 29-4.6.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Rushing. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none. May we have roll call, please, Ms. Carroll.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.

Rushing,

Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll. Voting No: Ms. Geuea Jones,

Ms. Loe. Motion carries 5-2, with one abstention.

MS. CARROLL: The vote is six-two; the motion is carried.

MS. RUSSELL: Five-two.

MR. ZENNER: Five-two-one.

MS. RUSSELL: One.

MR. ZENNER: Abstention.

MS. CARROLL: Yes. It is five-two. Sorry. Five-two, one abstention.

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

Move to approve the requested PD plan major amendment to be known as Discovery Park Plat 5, Lot 501 PD Plan Major Amendment Number 1, the associated design adjustment for the structure over a lot line, and the associated design exception to Section 29-4.6.

Yes: 5 - Burns, Rushing, Russell, Toohey and Carroll

No: 2 - Loe and Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - MacMann

Abstain: 1 - Stanton

Case # 154-2020 Map Area # 1

A request by the City of Columbia to correctively rezone approximately 19 acres of land containing the addresses listed below from district C-2 (Central Business) and IG (Industrial) to M-C (Mixed-use Corridor) and M-OF (Mixed-use Office). The subject parcels are generally located north of White Gate Drive, east of Paris Road, and along both the east and west frontages of Towne Drive.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning of the subject parcels to specific zoning classifications.

MS. LOE: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: So what you're saying is, as long as we just say per staff's recommendation, whatever you've recommended, we just roll with that.

MR. ZENNER: I will read off each of the individual addresses for the purposes of the public record.

MS. LOE: All right. Any other questions for staff? Ex parte. Before we move forward, 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 this case in front of us. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Commissioner discussion?

MS. CARROLL: Question for staff?

MS. LOE: Okay. Ms. Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: You're going to read off each individual address and someone is making a single motion for all of them?

MR. ZENNER: We'll just do it that way.

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: And if there is an issue -- let me ask the question, though, of the Commission. Is there an issue with anything that is being proposed -- part of your discussion? If there is no issue, we're just going to this then as 11 individual addresses being read off with their corresponding zoning and one vote.

MS. LOE: Well this is still public case, so I'm still going to open public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: Seeing none, we will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Teddy? Is there a motion?

MS. LOE: Does Tim Teddy's comments count as public comment?

MS. RUSSELL: He wasn't fast enough. No.

MS. LOE: Okay. Ms. Burns?

MR. STANTON: Oh.

MS. LOE: She had her hand up first. Sorry, Mr. Stanton.

MS. BURNS: If there is no additional discussion, I will frame this motion that -- to approve Paris Road and Towne Drive rezoning, including the 11 addresses that will be read into the record.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none.

MR. ZENNER: Pursuant to the motion on the floor, the following requested or recommended zoning classifications shall be assigned to the 11 parcels in the Paris Road and Towne Drive rezoning request, Case 154-2020 Map Area #1: 1611 Towne Drive, M-C; 1621 Towne Drive, M-C; 1621 Towne Drive, Suite A and B, M-C; 1626 Towne Drive, M-C; 1627 Towne Drive, M-C; 1632 Towne Drive, M-C; 1801 Towne Drive, M-OF; 2116 Paris Road, M-C; 2202 Paris Road, M-C; 2206 Paris Road, M-C; 2210 Paris Road, M-C; 2302 Paris Road, M-C; Lot 5B, Paris Road Village Plat 2, M-C; Lot 5C Paris Road Village Plat 2, M-C; hereby approved by the Planning Commission by a vote of those in favor.

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

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.

Rushing,

Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: Eight votes to zero, the motions carry.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for rezoning will be forwarded to City Council.

Move to approve Paris Road and Towne Drive rezoning as follows: 1611 Towne Drive, M-C; 1621 Towne Drive, M-C; 1621 Towne Drive, Suite A and B, M-C; 1626 Towne Drive, M-C; 1627 Towne Drive, M-C; 1632 Towne Drive, M-C; 1801 Towne Drive, M-OF; 2116 Paris Road, M-C; 2202 Paris Road, M-C; 2206 Paris Road, M-C; 2210 Paris Road, M-C; 2302 Paris Road, M-C; Lot 5B, Paris Road Village Plat 2, M-C; Lot 5C Paris Road Village Plat 2, M-C

Yes: 8 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, Carroll and Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - MacMann

Case # 154-2020, Map Area # 3 - 110 E. Ash Street

A request by the City of Columbia to correctively rezone 110 E. Ash Street from C-2 (Central Business) to M-OF (Mixed-use Office). The subject property is located approximately 115-feet east of the intersection of First Street and Ash Street and is presently improved with an office building housing True Line Title Company.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning of the subject parcel to M-OF.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Before we move to questions of Mr. Zenner, I'd 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. Are there any questions for Mr. Zenner? Seeing none. We'll open up the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: Seeing none, we'll close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commissioner discussion? Ms. Russell? I don't see any reason to not propose a motion, so in the Case of 154-2020 Map Area #3, I move to approve the requested zoning of the subject parcel to M-OF.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none. Ms. Carroll, may we have a roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.

Russell,

Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms.

Rushing. Motion carries 8-0

MS. CARROLL: Eight to zero, motion is carried.

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

Move to approve the requested zoning of the subject parcel to M-OF.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, Carroll and Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - MacMann

Case # 154-2020, Map Area # 3 - 30 E. Broadway

A request by the City of Columbia to correctively rezone five (5) remnant parcels of C-2 (Central Business) zoned land to R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) district that are located along the eastern boundary of the Columbia Cemetery. The subject parcels are located on property address as 30 E. Broadway and are used as burial sites for human remains.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning of the five remnant parcels to R-MF.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Before we move to Commissioner 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. Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Just for disclosure, I am a part owner of five plots in the areas that we're talking about, but I don't think that that impacts me now and it certainly won't impact me when I go into that plot, so --

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Burns, for your frank disclosure. Any other comments? Seeing none. Are there any questions for Mr. Zenner? If not, we will move to public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: I see none. We will close public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Ms. Russell? You lost that draw.

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. In the case of 154-2020, Map Area #3, I move to approve the recommended R-MF zoning.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none. May we have a roll call, please, Ms. Carroll.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr.

Toohy,

Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms.

Russell. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: Eight to zero, the motion is carried.

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

Move to approve the recommended R-MF zoning.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, Carroll and Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - MacMann

Case # 154-2020, Map Area # 4 - 909 University Avenue

A request by the City of Columbia to correctively rezone property located in the northeast corner of 909 University Avenue from C-2 (Central Business) to M-OF (Mixed-use Office). The subject property is located at the south of the intersection of Watson Place and Woodson Way, west of the Hitt Street Parking Garage and is presently undeveloped.

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

Staff Report was given by Mr. Pet Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning of the subject parcel to M-OF.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Before we move on to questions for Mr. Zenner, I'd like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte related to this case to please disclose that information now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for Mr. Zenner? There aren't. We will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: You're running out of time, Mr. Teddy. Okay. One more chance after this.

MR. ZENNER: Maybe our attorney can step up and correct me. I don't know.

MS. LOE: We'll close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion?

MR. STANTON: I'd like to entertain a motion. I would like to entertain a motion.

MS. LOE: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 154-2020, Map Area #4 - 909 University Avenue rezoning, I move to rezone from M-F -- M-OF -- excuse me -- approval of recommended zoning M-OF.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Russell. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none. May we have roll call, please, Ms. Carroll.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.

Burns,

Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr.

Toohey. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: Eight to zero, the motion is carried.

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

Move to approve recommended zoning to M-OF.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, Carroll and Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - MacMann

Case # 154-2020, Map Area # 4 - 909 Lowry Mall

A request by the City of Columbia to correctively rezone property addressed as 909 Lowry Mall from C-2 (Central Business) to R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling). The subject property is centrally location on the campus of the University of Missouri and is presently used as the Student Success Center.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning of the subject parcel to R-MF.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Before we move on to questions for staff, I would like to ask any Commissioners who have had any ex parte prior to this meeting related to this case to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on behalf of this case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for Mr. Zenner? If there aren't, we'll open the floor for public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: Still can't get any public comment. All right. We will close the floor.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I'm going to propose a motion. In the Case of 154-2020, Map Area #4, I move to approve the requested rezoning of subject parcel to R-MF.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none. Ms. Carroll, may we have a roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: Eight to zero, the motion carries.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Recommendation for approval for rezoning will be forwarded to City Council. That concludes our cases for the evening and brings us to Public Comments.

Move to approve the requested rezoning to R-MF.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, Carroll and Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - MacMann

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. LOE: That concludes our cases for the evening and brings us to Public Comments.

MS. LOE: Which there are none.

VII. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. LOE: I'm sure that will have something.

MR. ZENNER: Yes. Always. I mean, I can't leave you without imparting valuable information. Your next meeting will be October 22. We get to continue in our work session the discussion of short-term rental. And as I have suggested, put your thinking caps on and we will come back and wrap up our session which was productive this evening. We do have a couple of items on the upcoming agenda. You won't hear from me, but we do have some cases. October 22's meeting includes just two. We have 906 Providence Road, which is a final plat and a design adjustment for the Alpha Phi Sorority Home. They are looking at combining some property and then preparing for potentially a building project that will involve the reconstruction of the existing structures. So that will be one of the last fraternity or sorority houses that I believe that we have left to be reconstructed in Greek Town. And the second item that is on the agenda is 190-2020, Discovery Park Plat 2B, Lot 6. This is a PD plan revision, and I don't have to probably hint to where you all know that this one is located. It's down off of Endeavor, so we will be doing another plan revision in this particular area. Mr. Smith will be delivering that one to you, if I recall correctly. So those are your items. Just to give you a little bit of an overview. Oh, I apologize. It's not off of Endeavor. That's the -- that's the next months. Your Alpha Phi house is there and it's on the right-hand side off Providence Road just across from Bingham. And then on the right-hand side is our Plat 2, Lot 6. This is originally a storm-water lot that has never had a -- never had a development plan on it. And what is being proposed at this point is actually what was shown on a construction plan for a sidewalk network of some overlooks and some other pedestrian amenities to serve the Aria Apartments and some of the other residential development in this particular area. We felt that we needed to have a plan in order to have those amenities identified, and that is what this is about. I apologize. We have the next PD plan off of Endeavor coming not at the 22nd's meeting, but it will be at your first November meeting. So stay

turned for some more down off of Endeavor. It's coming, don't worry. But we won't have anything else to offer you until the November meeting, and at that point, we'll be back hopefully discussing our -- our UDC amendments for subdivisions in work sessions and some other projects.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. LOE: I have one before we move on to -- last meeting, we welcomed the slate of 2021 officers, but I'm at huge fault for not thanking Ms. Burns for her service as Commission secretary. So, Tootie, thank you for your years of dedicated roll calling. We are in your debt.

MS. BURNS: It was my pleasure. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: We rarely had to correct her on her counts. When in doubt, we always pulled the phone out and did the math.

MS. LOE: She had her phone by her all the time. It offered a whole another level of entertainment.

MS. BURNS: Well, I had to follow Commissioner Loe as secretary, and that was a tough act to follow, so -- I have no doubt that our new secretary will fall right into the role very well.

MS. LOE: She's already changing things up, I've noticed. Any additional comments?

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE - October 22, 2020 @ 7 pm (tentative)

X. ADJOURNMENT

MR. STANTON: Move to adjourn.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Russell. We're adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.)

(Off the record)

Motion to adjourn