



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 5, 2020

7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Council Chambers

Columbia City Hall

701 E. Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. LOE: Okay. We are going to bring the November 5th Planning and Zoning meeting to order.

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

MS. CARROLL: We have nine people; we have a quorum.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Carroll.

Present: 9 - Tootie Burns, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Lee Russell, Anthony Stanton, Brian Toohey, Michael MacMann, Valerie Carroll and Sharon Geuea Jones

II. INTRODUCTIONS

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

MR. ZENNER: Yes, there is, ma'am. You should have in front of you a request to table item 201-20. We will get to that, so that is an adjustment to the agenda, and that was a public hearing item.

MS. LOE: Thank you. With that adjustment.

MS. RUSSELL: I move to approve that agenda.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Stanton. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a minor point of order. It's -- this next case is 20, not 02, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. It was the first case of 2021.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you. The number was wrong --

MS. LOE: All right.

MR. MACMANN: -- on the agenda. That's why I spoke.

MS. LOE: We have a motion on the floor. I'll take a thumbs up to approve the agenda.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: It looks unanimous.

Approved Agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**October 22, 2020 Regular Meeting**

MS. LOE: That brings us to the meeting minutes. Everyone should have gotten a copy of the October 22nd, 2020, meeting minutes. Were there any adjustments or edits to those minutes?

Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Russell. Take a thumbs up approval on the meeting minutes.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: Unanimous.

Approved Minutes.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**Case # 201-20**

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of Hemme Construction (owner), seeking rezoning from R-1 (One-family Dwelling) to PD (Planned Development) and approval of the development plan to be known as "The Cottages of Northridge". The intent of the PD is to enable cottage-style dimensional standards for 17 single-family structures without allowing duplexes. The 2.45-acre property is located north of the intersection of Northridge Drive and Wayside Drive.

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

MS. LOE: Now Mr. MacMann has me confused.

MR. MACMANN: Apologies.

MS. LOE: We have a tabling request.

MS. LOE: But we do have a tabling request. But this was advertised as a public hearing?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, ma'am. And the tabling request, as stated within the letter, is to resolve or to allow for resolution of an outstanding technical issue as it relates to our plan that goes along with this request for planned development, which also constitutes a preliminary plat. So until we're capable of resolving the preliminary plat technical issue, the applicant is seeking to have the project tabled for -- until the December 10th meeting. That will be more than sufficient time in order to resolve the matter and allow the plan to be rereviewed. And, yes, it was advertised as a public hearing; and therefore, if there are any members of public that are here, if they would like

to express whatever concerns they may have, given that this was an advertised date for this, that is fine. However, staff is not prepared to make a presentation this evening.

MS. LOE: All right. So just as a matter of process, we'll skip the staff report, go to public comment --

MR. ZENNER: If there is public comment.

MS. LOE: -- if there is public comment, and then move on to Commissioner action.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: So public comment. If anyone was here to make comment on this project, we're not having a presentation because there is a request to table it. But if you have comments, you can come forward and those will be recorded. Please give your name and address for the record, and we do limit comments to three minutes, just to keep it fair for everyone.

MS. ANDERSON: Hi. My name is Robin Anderson, and I'm the resident at 2601 Northridge, which is the property directly east adjacent. My husband and son and I moved into this property three months ago and we were not informed of the rezoning request when we purchased the home. However, we knew that the property was owned by the seller's agent, Ray Hemme, and that it would eventually be developed. However, in our research in the neighborhood, we moved out of the county into this neighborhood and into the city knowing that our -- our taxes would be increased and knowing that -- you know, what was in store for us. But we did the research kind of based on the neighborhoods directly west to it that had 11 properties on it and similar properties, single-family homes in the area. I don't see how 17 properties are going to fit on there, especially with drainage issues. There's a traffic problem on Northridge in that people constantly drive over 25 or 30 miles per hour. There's elementary school and two middle schools in the vicinity, and I'm concerned about how my property value is going to be affected. It's a home in the area that has a little bit more square footage, and so it's kind of unique and had to be adjusted for comps for that issue, but I don't want -- I would hate to see this go up and then to see our home value immediately decrease by \$50,000, which is what I'm afraid of. Yeah. That's all. Thanks.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker?

MR. STANTON: Excuse me, ma'am.

MS. ANDERSON: Yes?

MS. LOE: Ms. Anderson? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: What would make you happy? If the shoe was on the other foot --

MS. ANDERSON: Well, I suppose what I imagined was that there would -- it would be developed and there's right in the middle of that open property, there's a -- a creek

running through it. And so what I had imagined was that a road would go either directly west or east of that, and then properties would be developed into that. So there -- it would look very similar to the property on the west. Right? I don't want people ten feet from my driveway. That's what's going to happen. And just had I known that, I probably - that it was going to be so densely populated, we wouldn't have purchased that property. We moved away specifically from neighbor issues and, you know, that's just -- so what I had imagined was that there would be fewer houses there, which we were okay with.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you. Any additional speakers?

MR. HULEN: Christian Hulen, 3912 Cannon Court. This may be a little premature since we kind of, I guess, skipped the presentation that's been tabled, but I know myself and many other residents are just curious and have major concerns about watershed issues. Maybe that's what's going to be addressed, but not having seen the presentation, that property tends to hold a significant amount of water during heavy rainfalls. And without us not really knowing what the plan for development is, are they -- are they going to elevate the entire property? You know, we're not really sure what the plan is and especially those of us on Cannon Court, on the east side of Cannon Court, are looking at a significant amount of water being diverted back towards our property, just based on our experience in living there. I mean, we've all got photos of any time a major rain comes through, it doesn't look so much like a field, it looks a little bit more like a pond. We're just kind of curious how that's going to be handled.

MS. LOE: There will be more information when the project is fully presented, but your comments are recorded for now. Are there any questions for this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a generalized comment. It sounds like you all are going to have some, you know, valid and neighborly concerns. I would strongly encourage you to look for this next posting, and you guys make sure that you show up and express your concerns at that time, so -- because I know that apparently quite a few of you have come for this.

MR. HULEN: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Michael Brooks, 3908 Cannon Court. And my concern is the water problem. I have pictures of it on September 11th where a third of it is under water, and September 13th of it, and it was under water again. But -- and my other concerns would be the abatement pond that they want to build to catch the water. We're -- we're a block from a grade school of six- and seven- and eight-year-olds. When one of them drowns in

this pond, one of you is responsible. We don't need that many cottages. Mr. Hemme, he bought that property, and he knew it was in R-1. Now if he wants to build R-1 houses, I guess we'll just -- we'll discuss that at a different Council meeting. But he bought it with the intention to shove it through so he can build more properties and you're going to have a traffic problem that is -- drive up there on 8:00 in the morning or at 3:00 in the afternoon, the traffic problem is horrendous because of the grade school, of kids in and out, of kids walking up and down the streets. We don't need that many houses in two and a half acres. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? I see none at this time. Thank you. Are there any additional speakers on this case?

MS. HENDREN: My name is Elissa Hendren; I'm at 3900 Cannon Court. I'm also worried about the watershed issue in our backyard. It's always -- always very wet down where it's undeveloped right now. We moved into this property in 2018 knowing it would be developed, and having that many houses back there, I'm just going off of what everybody said. I completely agree and I just want you all to know that it really is a valid issue. The traffic out there, kids walk up and down those streets all the time, and it's already an issue, and adding that many more folks there and that many more cars is really a bigger issue. So thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? I see none. Any additional speakers?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: My name is Kathy O'Laughlin; I live on 2500 Northridge Drive. I ditto what everyone said here. The water problem, the traffic, the rezoning I'm against. I never would have bought the house had I known that this was going to happen. The -- yeah. The traffic, it's not just the elementary school; I think people are cutting through. Instead of using Blue Ridge, they're cutting through on Northridge to get to places faster to the west side down. Yeah. I'm, you know, discouraged that I don't know the details, because I was really hoping to come here tonight and know what the plans were, so we're kind of at a loss as to, you know, further questions that we have, but, I guess, as you said, we'll back on December 12th or 10th --

MS. CARROLL: December 10th is what it has on this note.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: -- and -- and get further detail, but I'm very adamantly against the rezoning at this point in time.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? I see none. Any additional speakers? If there are not, we'll close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.

MS. LOE: Commissioner discussion? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners don't have any comments about the tabling, in the matter of item 201 -- now I'm doing it -- 201-20, tabling request by Crockett Engineering for Hemme Construction, I move to table to date certain 10 December of 2020.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. LOE: We have a second by Mr. Stanton. We have motion on the floor to table. 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. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 9-0.

MS. CARROLL: Nine votes, the motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation to table to December 10th will be made.

MR. ZENNER: If I may, prior to moving on to the next item. Those that are in attendance, many of you were holding an agenda this evening. The link to the existing staff report that was published for this hearing this evening, along with the development plan, is available for your reviewing if you would like to read and become more familiar with what was being proposed on this property. Also, if you are so inclined, the project engineer associated with this project is probably capable of answering some of your questions if they are not able to be answered through the site plan that you will see within the staff report, and that is Crockett Engineering. They are a local firm here, and you may be able to get their telephone number off of the plan. If not, again, it is Crockett Engineering, and they are here in town and in the telephone book. So we will potentially have a revised staff report based on the needs to address our particular technical issues, so please keep your eye on notification that you will receive from our offices. If you are within 185 feet of the property, you will get another postcard or a letter indicating the public hearing date and the date that the agenda for this meeting will be published. The link to all of the report material will be online and available to you. The case manager for this internally with our office is Brad Kelley, and he is also available should you have questions and the contact information for him is -- was provided to you on a postcard that you should have received, as well as the correspondence for this meeting this evening. So if you would like to follow up with him, as well, you are more than welcome to do so. We thank you for coming out this evening and apologize for the inconvenience that this has created.

Move to table to date certain 10 December of 2020

Yes: 9 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, MacMann, Carroll and Geuea Jones

Case # 02-2021

A request by Simon & Struempf Engineering (agent), on behalf of Jeremy Spillman and Brooks Chandler (owners), seeking permanent R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) zoning on 2.4-acres subject to annexation. The subject property is located at 200 W. Old Plank Road.

MS. LOE: We're going to move on to the second case for the evening.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested R-MF permanent zoning, pending annexation.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Question for staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Before we get to that juncture, I need to recuse on this.

MS. LOE: And I need to ask ex parte. So if there's any Commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to this meeting related to this case, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. Seeing -- Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I have nothing with regard to ex parte.

MS. LOE: No ex parte. Okay. Seeing none. Questions?

MS. BURNS: Mr. Palmer, and I'm sure this was in your report. For your postcards and newspaper ad, did you have any response?

MR. PALMER: I didn't have any direct comments. I had a couple of questions, basically, about what was being proposed, and at this time, nothing is being proposed. We had a concept meeting on it, but that was it. The other one was because there was a typo in the ad, so I fixed it when I sent the property owners letters out.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: How many more properties need to be annexed before the City can widen the road?

MR. PALMER: Well, immediately adjacent here, you're seeing these yellow -- yellow lines. Those are property lines, so there would be this guy, this guy, and this one, and then I guess there's another property here. So just in this kind of block, if you will, those properties, plus whatever is across the street, which is basically the one large property with the pond and the property here. So in order to get from here to here all the proper right-of-way, all of those properties would have to be platted at least before we could get

that right-of-way.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. So there's no way to -- there's no way to fix the problem because it's already bad?

MR. PALMER: Right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: All right. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Additional questions? Mr. Palmer, is Old Plank Road adequate beyond those boundaries?

MR. PALMER: I didn't do much further past where I just kind of indicated. I kind of -- the city boundary here and the city boundary here, or the Bethel. But, generally, I -- from personal knowledge, I think it's roughly the same width all the way down. It doesn't have a shoulder anywhere and ditches on both sides, but -- but basically, yeah. It's -- it's substandard as far as width is concerned and, of course, to gain more width, a lot of it will have to require some more right-of-way, as well.

MS. LOE: What density is the property to the -- the multi-family property within city to the west of the subject site?

MR. PALMER: I can -- let me run over all of those. So the property to the west is seven and a half units per acre. There's actually 163 apartments on that property, so a pretty -- pretty good chunk of multi-family, but it's on a much larger property, so it's spread out. Again, the property to the east at the intersection is 6.7 units per acre and, again, it's -- I believe those are kind of duplex-type cottage-ish buildings. And the property to the south is 16.9 units per acre, and yeah. That's the one kind of comparable to what we might see on this property.

MS. LOE: You mentioned that the road was substandard as infrastructure. The sewer in this area, we've discussed it before.

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MS. LOE: Is it -- the capacity okay?

MR. PALMER: The capacity is there. It's one of the strange situations on the south side of town where they will actually be tapping into a county sewer that then flows into a city sewer. So they are being served by the city, but it requires them to tap the county first.

MS. LOE: All right. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none, we will open up the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.

MS. LOE: If anyone has public comment they would like to make on this case, please give us your name and address for the record.

MR. SIMON: Hello. My name is Keenan Simon, address is 210 Park Avenue here

in Columbia. I'm the civil engineer that's working with the property owner to request permanent zoning and annexation to the City of Columbia. I think there's a few points that I -- the property owner would like to touch on with regards to the redevelopment and intent of this property. Obviously, the property would be required to be replatted, and at that time, we would be dedicating some additional right-of-way and utility easements to bring it kind of up to the standard of what's required from the City which would then allow for any future redevelopment of Old Plank Road if -- if necessary. Currently, the site does have all the utilities necessary to support a redevelopment. There's a 12-inch water main on the north side. There's ample sewer capacity to -- to redevelop that in a higher density, and there's also electric and everything else that would be -- that would support this, as well. Although the R-MF zoning has a maximum allowed density of the 17.4 units per acre, it's really not in the owner's intent to -- to redevelop that property similar to like what is shown at the Walnut Brook Condominiums, the apartments to the south, which is shown in that display. Their density that they're looking at that would be sustainable would be somewhere in the range of the 13 to 14 units per acre. It's not really the intent to do a maximum density, but rather it's the approach that's going to best fit the site and the layout versus trying to force it. I do -- I mean, there's no doubt that Old Plank is an unimproved roadway. It does lack the city standard of the width, but if you look at it from a standpoint of, you know, a typical MoDOT state highway, it is sufficient for traffic, but it is not necessarily the standard of what the City of Columbia would want. So with that, I'm here for any questions or comments or anything else you might have.

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

MR. SIMON: Thank you very much.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case? If there are none, we'll close the public comment period.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: If there are no comments, I'll make a motion. In the case of 02-2021, 200 West Old Plank Road of permanent zoning, I move to approve the requested R-MF permanent zoning pending annexation by the Council.

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

Loe, Mr. Stanton. Abstention: Mr. MacMann. Motion carries 8-0 with one abstention.

MS. CARROLL: There are eight votes in favor and one abstention. The motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. That brings us to the end of our cases for the evening.

Move to approve the requested R-MF permanent zoning pending annexation by the Council.

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

Abstain: 1 - MacMann

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Any additional public comments? No. They're running away. All right.

VII. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. ZENNER: Yes, there are staff comments, as usual. Your next meeting is going to be on the 19th of November, two weeks from today. We will have a regular work session on the 19th. Come hungry, it is your Thanksgiving dinner, so we will feed you, and then fatten you for slaughter at the meeting, which comes next, which we have a number of cases on our upcoming agenda. And if Rusty can be my Vanna White for me. This is the pain that you all will feel, so I'm not going to feed you too many potatoes. But, nonetheless, one subdivision request. This is from the most recent annexation permanent zoning. This is actually at the backside of Wellington Manor Subdivision off of St. Charles Road. This is a simple subdivision of an existing outlot into two, and an adjustment of another lot as part of the secondary lot being created. And then you will notice a segment of our meeting agenda that we do not often see altogether. Subdivisions and public hearings is we have one design adjustment and a preliminary plat, and that has to deal with the State Farm property at 4700 Providence Road. It is a two-lot preliminary plat that identifies -- it has -- that's our favorite topic -- a property line through a parking area, and I'll be so happy when we can avoid having to tell you have those design adjustments. We also have then the combined element of a permanent zoning request, so another zoning request subject to annexation, and a corresponding preliminary plat, which is an oddity. We don't often see those, and that falls under this general category of subdivision and public hearings. The preliminary or the permanent zoning request, will have to be acted on first, because we can't act to take subdivision development until you've actually considered the property being inside the city's corporate limits, and that is why the preliminary plat comes second. So it's going to be a little bit out of what we normally would do, but that's why they're grouped together. There will be two separate staff reports. Mr. Smith will be delivering both of them, and I'm not quite sure at this point if we're going to have a little bit of overlap within the two to discuss the subdivision matter, as well, while he's discussing permanent zoning. But it is an R-1 request, so this is a typical residential subdivision up off of St. Charles Road -- or Lake of the Woods. And then we have three standard public hearings. Endeavor Center West, this is a PD plan down in Discovery Park. We have a revision off of Green Meadows. This is just to the south of the Macadoodles site and the traffic circle that's at Green Meadows and -- not Clark -- why am I -- Carter -- Carter Lane, the Carter Lane-Green Meadows traffic circle. And then another PD plan down at Discovery and it's Discovery Business Park, so our development down at Discovery Park is heating up, and you will have two more development plan requests on your December 10th agenda in Discovery,

so we will have, if I'm not incorrect, five or six active development plans all in the same location here in this latter part of this year. So if we go to the next one, just to familiarize yourself with where all of these are in case you're wondering -- if we can advance, Rusty. So your -- the Bradbury Drive one, which is at the backside of the Wellington Manor Subdivision, the State Farm property, which most of you are probably familiar with, our property there up of north Lake of the Woods, the first one being -- the same map, but one being the annexation, the other being the preliminary plat for the same area, and then our last one for -- or we've got two more. That is the Endeavor property for the PD plan, along with our revision for the Green Meadows property, and then our final one would be just to the south of -- southwest of the Endeavor property, and that is the Discovery Business Park property immediately adjacent to Tolton Catholic High School. At that point, we are almost out of development land at Discovery Park, at least off of the Endeavor extension. There is still a little bit more to the rear of Endeavor that is left yet to be developed, and those will be probably subsequently coming. The remaining portions of Discovery that are the open M-C with is up along the interstate and the interchange, and then some planned district to the south of the interchange off of Ponderosa. Those are the remaining areas in Discovery Park that are left to be developed at this point. So with that, that is all we have to offer. Again, I appreciate your comments this evening as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan surveys. Just so those that are in TV land watching and may have interest, we are extending the surveying instruments that we have for the Comprehensive Plan update, where we are seeking the community's input on priorities, as well as observations of plan implementation and then possible emerging trends until the 20th of November. You can reach those surveys via the City's website, www.cmo.gov, <<http://www.cmo.gov>> and then go to our community development home page and you will be able to find a link to get to our surveys. We will have more discussion as it relates to the status report at your next work session, as well as a discussion of our urban service area boundary map and potential revisions that will be identified as being a next step as we move forward in the Comprehensive Plan updating process. And with that, I thank you very much for your attention this evening, and I'll get you out of here before 8:00.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. LOE: Commission discussions or comments? Mr. MacMann?

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE - November 19, 2020 @ 7 pm (tentative)

X. ADJOURNMENT

MR. MACMANN: I move to adjourn.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Ms. Russell. We are adjourned. Thanks, everybody.

(The meeting adjourned 7:46 p.m.)

(Off the record)

Move to adjourn