

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

NOVEMBER 5, 2015

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

**Mr. Steve Reichlin
Ms. Sara Loe
Mr. Rusty Strodman
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Ms. Tootie Burns
Ms. Joy Rushing
Mr. Dan Harder**

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Ms. Lee Russell

I) CALL TO ORDER

MR. REICHLIN: I will now call the November 5, 2015, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order. May we have a roll call, please.

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have a quorum.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you, Ms. Secretary.

II) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. REICHLIN: At this time, I'll entertain whether or not there any adjustments to the agenda.

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, sir. Agenda is as written.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you.

III) APPROVAL OF REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

MR. REICHLIN: And with that, I'll request approval of the regular meeting minutes for the October 22nd meeting. Is there anybody who has any corrections or changes? Seeing none. I will entertain a motion for approval.

MR. STANTON: Move to approve.

MR. STRODTMAN: Second.

MR. REICHLIN: Okay. Thumbs up on that?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you very much.

IV) SUBDIVISIONS

Case No. 15-204

A request by A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of Vineyards Columbia, LLC (owner) for approval of a 289 lot revised preliminary plat to be known as "Vineyards Preliminary Plat #2". The approximate 266.20-acre site is located southwest of the intersection of Route WW and Rolling Hills Road and lying on north and south sides of the South Fork of the Grindstone Creek. (This item has been requested to be tabled to the November 19 meeting. The item was tabled at the October 8 meeting.)

MR. REICHLIN: It's my understanding that this matter has been tabled.

MR. ZENNER: Yes, it has. And, sir, if you would like to read 15-205, as well, so they are both captured in the public record together, I would appreciate that, and I will then have some comments for the Commission as to the reasoning behind the tabling request.

MR. REICHLIN: I'll be happy to.

CASE NO. 15-205

A request by A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of Vineyards Columbia, LLC (owner) for approval of a one-lot final plat to be known as "Vineyards Plat #4" and a variance from Section 25-48.1 (Sidewalk installation) on property platted after 2001. The approximate 24.46-acre site is located southwest of the intersection of Route WW and Rolling Hills Road south of the extension of Columbia Gorge Parkway. (This item has been requested to be tabled to the November 19 meeting. The item was tabled at the October 8 meeting.)

MR. REICHLIN: Does that suffice?

MR. ZENNER: That will suffice for me. Both 15-204 and 15-205, as the chairman has indicated, have been requested to be tabled at the request of Columbia Public Schools to the November 19th meeting. The next graphic I am going to show you, I am showing for the purposes of public information, as well as clarification as to the changes that have been requested or why this item is being requested. As you are aware, this item -- both these items were originally presented to the Planning Commission on October 8th. At that time, there was a request made by staff to have this item tabled until the November 5th meeting to allow us an opportunity to evaluate a late sensitivity analysis that was submitted by CPS's engineers. We wanted to verify particular traffic-related concerns that we had against the City's traffic model. Since that tabling, we have had an opportunity to discuss with the school district opportunities to be able to revise the preliminary and the final plat to address particular concerns that were presented to the Commission by residents of both The Woodlands and The Vineyards. The graphic that you see before you and that the public sees presented is the graphic that has been submitted to us by Columbia Public Schools and their engineers that reflects the changes that CPS is proposing to make to the final plat, and the final plat is what will create the school's parcel to which they will build the new east elementary school that is replacing Cedar Ridge. This graphic is conceptual at this point. We are still waiting on the final plat, the actual technical final plat that will basically replace what is in Case No. 15-205. That is the reason for the request to table to the November 19th meeting. It is to ensure that what you see here on this graphic in front of you is what is presented as part of the actual formal final plat that will be considered by the Planning Commission on November 19th. The preliminary plat, which is Case 15-204, is not being revised. The lot layout associated with that plat, the revision of the preliminary which shows the school site and then shows the roadways that are highlighted here on this graphic, does not change any. So that plat will not be revised, just the final, but we want to make sure that we have all of the details between both the preliminary and the final plat together in one hearing in order to allow the public that was here on October 8th to return, have an opportunity to comment publicly as it relates to these two cases

together. And again, the graphic you see in front of you is the graphic that has been worked on by CPS to resolve many of the concerns that were expressed by the public. It is supported by City staff in addressing the concerns that we had as it related to the traffic. It does offer an alternative access directly to Rolling Hills, as well. That is the lower southern road. So we will have a summary report prepared for the October 19th meeting -- or November 19th meeting for both 15-204 and 15-205. With that, we are recommending support of the tabling to allow for the additional final plat to be submitted in conformance to what you see here before you, and we will be happy to any questions should you have them.

MR. REICHLIN: Questions of staff? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Do we need to address these separately?

MR. ZENNER: No. You can address them concurrently as one item, as we would address them originally.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other questions of staff?

MR. REICHLIN: Would anybody care to make a motion on this matter?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 15-204 and 15-205, I move to accept the tabling until the -- to the November 19th meeting.

MS. BURNS: Second.

MR. REICHLIN: That was Ms. Burns. May we have a roll call, please?

MS. LOE: Yes. So this in cases 15-204 and 15-205.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing. Motion carries 7-0

Ms. Loe: We have seven yeses, the vote carries.

Case No. 15-227

A request by The Columbia Development Group, LLC (owner) for approval of a revised preliminary plat affecting 67 R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) zoned lots in the northern portion of Steeplechase Estates. The 47.1-acre subject site is located on the east side of Howard Orchard Road, west of Thornbrook Subdivision.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Steve MacIntyre of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the revised preliminary plat.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of staff? Seeing none. We'll go forward with encouraging anybody in the audience who has information regarding this that can help us with our decision-making process.

MR. MURPHY: Good evening, Chairman, Commissioners. My name is Kevin Murphy; I'm with A Civil Group, offices at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. I think Mr. MacIntyre's report covers this pretty well. It's just a realignment of the -- of the one road, and we've decreased the number of developable lots by, I think, seven, and thus creating more green space in doing so. But other than that, if

you have any questions, I would be happy to try to answer those.

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions of this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Well, I'll turn this matter over to the Commission for further comment.

Mr. Strodman? Am I missing somebody? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: He's pointing at me.

MR. REICHLIN: Okay.

MR. STANTON: I definitely support the changes. I commend the developer and the designers in rethinking how the roads are designed and taking into deep consideration the topography of the land. I'd definitely like to see more of that, and so I commend this -- these changes. So I plan to support it.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else? Mr. Strodman?

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll go ahead -- go ahead and make a motion if we're -- if we're done discussing it. I make a request for approval -- I'm sorry. Case 15-227, I make a request to approve the revised preliminary plat.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. REICHLIN: Ms. Rushing. Thank you. I'll take a roll call, please.

MS. LOE: Yes. In the case of 15-227.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing. Motion carries 7-0

MS. LOE: We have seven yeses. The motion is approved. The Commission's recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you.

V) PUBLIC HEARINGS

MR. REICHLIN: Okay. We'll now move into the public hearing portion of our meeting tonight.

Case No. 15-223

A request by the City of Columbia (owner) to rezone approximately 0.69 acres of land from PUD-4.3 to PUD-6.0 (Planned Unit Development) and approval of a PUD development plan to be known as "Lynn Street Cottages." The subject site is located on the north side of Lynn Street, approximately 200 feet west of Garth Avenue.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Steve MacIntyre of the Planning and Development Department.

Staff recommends:

- Approval of the proposed rezoning and associated Statement of Intent
- Approval of the PUD development plan
- Approval of a variance to allow reduced (six-foot) side yard perimeter setbacks.

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: When you indicated that the City would -- would own the common area; is that correct?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes, ma'am. It would be maintained in City ownership.

MS. RUSHING: And then will a fee be assessed against the property for the maintenance of that common area?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. That's the plan.

MS. RUSHING: And is ownership going to be limited to low-income people?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes, ma'am. It will be.

MR. REICHLIN: Is there anybody -- Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: You addressed the variance on the side yard. Can you discuss what appears to be a variance on the front yard from the standard PUD and the original PUD?

MR. MACINTYRE: The setback on the front yard at 20 feet is in keeping with the standards. I believe it's not out of line with --

MS. LOE: The -- Chapter 29 asks for 25 feet, and the original PUD for this property did have a 25-foot front-yard setback.

MR. MACINTYRE: Huh.

MS. LOE: Also, the R-2 adjoining this property would have a 25-foot front-yard setback, so I'm curious as to why that's been reduced in this case.

MR. MACINTYRE: If that's the case, it may be something that I missed in my review and perhaps it would be prudent to add that to the requested variance.

MS. LOE: Lynn Street seems to suffer from an inconsistency in front-yard setbacks, but if the -- any of the houses were rebuilt, I'm assuming they would be held to that 25-foot setback and it might be nice to establish -- or establish some consistency.

MR. MACINTYRE: In my review, the existing homes were -- along Lynn Street were consistent in setback, more or less, to these proposed homes setbacks, and I -- well, the PUD question that you raise about the setbacks, I would need to look into again because I can't recall off the top of my head. I believe I addressed or did review that correctly, but it's something I need to look into. Certainly, the consistency with the other -- what few homes remain on this street, I believe, are -- are consistent with the setbacks as shown here, which is 20 foot; is that correct? A 20-foot building line.

MS. LOE: Well, as you said, maybe it's something we can add to the list --

MR. MACINTYRE: Right.

MS. LOE: -- because the setbacks are as much about creating a street as they are much about buffering the home from street activity, so --

MR. MACINTYRE: Absolutely. Yeah.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Mr. Strodman?

MR. STRODTMAN: Without taking a lot of time, can you just highlight how the City is paying for this? Is this a grant or is this general fund or --

MR. MACINTYRE: Yeah. If you -- if you don't mind, I'll have Randy Cole speak to that.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. MACINTYRE: And I'll look up the other issue.

MR. COLE: Yeah. Thanks. I'm Randy Cole, and I work in the Community Development Department. I manage our Community Development Block Grant and HOME funds. So this project is being funded primarily out of City surplus funds. The City Manager set aside -- or recommended setting aside \$200,000 in City surplus funds that were then approved by Council as a part of this last budget process, and then we're going to make up the -- the rest of that gap, the \$300,000. We're anticipating that the development will be around \$500,000, with a local bank -- Providence Bank has offered to provide the whole -- a 1-percent interest loan for \$300,000 with zero origination fees, because they've been a partner in trying to start a similar project as this.

MR. STRODTMAN: You said it was Providence Bank?

MR. COLE: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I have a question for Mr. MacIntyre. What will the owners actually own? Will they own the structures or will they own the property incorporated into the red boxes we're seeing?

MR. MACINTYRE: Oh. Well, Randy seems ready to answer that, as well, so --

MR. COLE: Our initial plan as approved with -- with the budgetary process was to sell just the home, and that's what we're shooting for right now is just -- just the structure and not the land. Where we would maintain ownership of all the land, so we could take all of those costs out of the price and really drive down the price. And then be able to really control and make sure that low-income people go back into the homes when they resell, and also make sure that they resell at an affordable price. Tim Crockett incorporated also some flexibility in the plan to where if that doesn't come to fruition, they can be sold on those -- those smaller lots, also. So we have some flexibility if that doesn't gain traction. I fully anticipate and I'm fully putting every effort into making that gain -- that gain traction because that's the direction the Council and the Manager want to go, as well as a lot of other community partners, is starting a land trust.

MS. BURNS: So how long does the City anticipate being the owner of this common ground?

MR. COLE: I'm glad you asked -- asked that question. Most land trusts have 99-year ground leases. We also touch on another point where we're exploring the option of potentially setting up a 501(c)(3), so it would maintain under the City ownership. So there would be a separate board. That's how most cities that do it, do it that way to take the liability off the City over the long term. We're working with a couple other different cities that are in the process that have already done this, as well as some that are in the process of doing it right now. There's about 10,000 land-trust units across the country, so we're really evaluating what's the best way to do this.

MS. BURNS: May I ask one more question?

MR. REICHLIN: Go ahead.

MS. BURNS: Would the City also be maintaining the common driveways and the walkways as far

as snow removal, maintenance?

MR. COLE: Yes.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MR. COLE: That's the City or whatever entity we eventually create to do that, yes.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Mr. Strodman?

MR. STRODTMAN: Do you anticipate the fees that you would collect from these four residents to pay for the upkeep of everything?

MR. COLE: Yes. Yes, we would. So we have to look at what are those costs over time. Also most ground leases build in a set amount of percent that they can rise over time, given periods. It could be three years, it could be five years, but to give them the ability to expect what a rise might be, but yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay.

MR. REICHLIN: I had a question with regard to the City's involvement and where the Davis Bacon Act, more commonly known as prevailing wage law, will come into play with regard to the actual structures. Is the City going to administer the -- administer this -- the development as a public project or --

MR. COLE: I know for our HUD funds, Davis Bacon does not trigger unless you're developing more than eight units. You know, I didn't mention that HUD funds will be going into this, but they will be when the buyer goes in. We'll use those HUD funds to help with the home buyer assistance. But for home funding, which is the funding source we would use, which is a HUD source, it has to be eight units or more for that to trigger Davis Bacon.

MR. REICHLIN: So there -- so in order -- so then what you're saying is it'll help with overall affordability --

MR. COLE: To keep our construction costs lower, yes.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Are these going out to bid or are you having Job Point or to --

MR. COLE: Yeah. We'll be having it go out to bid and we'll definitely be working with Job Point in whatever form or fashion we can. There's two houses going in across the street, 106 and 110 Lynn. Those are ones that we purchased with HUD funds, demolished -- they were vacant and dilapidated, in very rough condition, and Job Point is reconstructing those right now, so we work with them quite -- quite a bit.

MR. STANTON: Using local and minority business or at least --

MR. COLE: We will definitely do our outreach --

MR. STANTON: -- lots of effort to --

MR. COLE: Yeah. Yeah. Definitely.

MR. HARDER: I have a question.

MR. REICHLIN: Mr. Harder?

MR. HARDER: Do you happen to know a kind of a range of the -- or kind of a ballpark idea of how much these houses would sell for?

MR. COLE: Yeah. Sure. So we did a bid on a single house or we had a bid for one about a year ago, and our price has been around \$125,000 for construction costs. Now, this -- this number could change a little bit, but I would anticipate getting that down to around \$90,000, \$95,000 range. So we can then add on some homebuyer assistance and get -- get the mortgage down to at least \$85,000, \$90,000 range, so we can get their -- their payment down as much as possible.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else? Seeing no one. Thank you for your time.

MR. COLE: Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. REICHLIN: I will now open the public hearing on this matter. Anybody wishing to comment about this project, please feel free.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett with Crockett Engineering, 2608 North Stadium. It was a privilege to work with Randy and the -- and the Community Development staff on this project. I think it's a very worthwhile project for our community. Not often do we get to work on a project like this that really puts a project like this before the public. I have a list of notes here I would like to cover, however, I think Mr. MacIntyre did a great job in his presentation. He covered about everything I had listed here, so I'll make it brief and I'll be happy to answer any question that you do have. Ms. Loe, I would like to talk a little bit about the setback. You are correct. We do want to have a street feel. We want a streetscape for Lynn -- for Lynn Street. If you -- if you notice, that's one thing when we did have a 20 feet, and Steve has talked about it, and he'll talk a little bit more about the building on it, I'm sure, but that's the reason why we put the garages on the rear portions of the houses. You know, we don't want the driveways out front where vehicles park out front along Lynn Street. We want to tuck those back behind the home so the home and the front porch is what you see when you drive along Lynn Street. That's exactly what we're trying to do is open up that feel and have that feel of a -- of a residential neighborhood, and I think the design kind of incorporates that a little bit, and that's what we're after. So if -- if that's -- helps explain that a little bit. That's what our intent was. So with that, I would be happy to answer any questions that the staff -- or the Commission may have.

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions of this speaker?

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you. Anybody -- anybody else wishing to comment on this matter, either for or against? Seeing no one.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. REICHLIN: I'll turn this matter over to Commissioners for their comments. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: This is in my neck of the woods and I really -- I really like this project. I'm kind of leery about the land-trust thing. It's kind of like having the American dream with strings attached, but I'll watch it very closely and see how that works out. This falls right in line with the affordable housing taskforce that did some work on this very issue almost ten years ago, and so it's great to kind of see some of this stuff flesh out and become reality, so I hope to see a lot more of these, and hopefully we'll learn from this project if it's successful. And this helps with density as well as affordability, so I think -- I plan to

support this project.

MR. REICHLIN: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I -- I'm glad to see innovative housing proposals coming in. I mean, with the housing unit ordinance, we were trying to find ways of increasing density or alternative means, and this seems to be another approach to doing that. I appreciate the design paying attention to the street and open spaces. We know this isn't always a given when you put these projects together. At the same point, I do want to double-check on that, especially make -- and I would be interested in what setback the Job Point houses are being held to across the street because I think establishing a feel for the street is as much about creating the neighborhood feel in the community as it is creating -- getting those yards in around the houses, as well.

MR. MACINTYRE: I can respond to that now. We have looked at -- up the code, and you're correct. It's a 25-foot regular standard, however, it falls under the same section for setbacks within a PUD, which are eligible for amendment by Council approval, so that would be Section 29-10(d)(7). The 20-foot minimum applies to garages in single-family PUD developments, but I think it is 20 feet for just a regular portion of a home. The setbacks, you can see on the aerial. Actually, if I back it up. There are fewer homes there in the Google than on this one, but you can see that the two homes that were in existence when this was taken -- I think it was 2011 -- were certainly shorter setback than -- as well as the homes across the street are certainly on the short side of setbacks. I would suggest that they are likely under 20 feet even or thereabouts with, of course, some variation between those. Some of them may be as short as ten, fifteen feet, I would suggest. I don't think it's going to be possible to scale that tonight in this circumstance, and I apologize for the oversight. However, my suggestion would be that the 20-foot setback is something that's more or less consistent with the requirements, the standard requirement, and is likely more in keeping with the character of the homes on that street segment, as well as the block. Since we are looking at, with the exception of one additional home along this side of Lynn Street on this block segment, it's really difficult to say what character exists anymore. The standard requirement, if there were -- if this were in a single-family R-1 district, would be to gauge an infill development setback based upon existing -- median setback of existing homes, but that only applies in cases where there's a 40 percent -- 40 percent of the frontages or lots have development on them. So in this case, you know, again, it's really up to you to decide whether or not you would want -- be willing to support a 20-foot setback, which is against the standard 25-foot requirement there.

MS. LOE: Which brings me back to I would be very interested in what standard the R-2 Job -- which I'm assuming the Job Point homes were held to. They're on an R-2 sites. So, I mean, I'm willing to say 20 feet or whatever setback the Job Point houses, because, obviously, someone has already decided that's a setback that's acceptable for the street for those homes. I don't think we should be making up different numbers for new construction going in along the same street, is my point.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other comments? I would just like to say that I'm happy to see that these vacant lots are being repurposed and I consider it an excellent use of public resources to infill these lots that home -- that had homes on them that were probably at one time needing to be removed and put --

replacing them with more modern, energy-efficient structures. With regard to the setback, I realize it's not our place to legislate what they should and shouldn't be, but from just a personal common sense point of view, on a street where you have -- that was developed years and years ago before we had the standards we have today, that I can see the advisability of trying to keep that scale on that particular street going forward, so I'm comfortable with the 20-foot setback. And with that, I intend to support this matter. Anybody care to -- Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: In conferring both with Mr. Cole, who is representing Community Development, and the project managers, as well as Mr. Crockett, if the Commission is so inclined to approve the project at this point with compliance to the PUD front setback requirement of 25 feet and a caveat to which we would not permit anything less than 20, that would be probably -- allow us an opportunity to also evaluate what is across the street at Job Point. If it -- if Job Point is 25 feet, we basically have complied with the setback that is across the street. If Job Point is at 20 feet, which we can't verify this evening, we can basically amend the plan prior to Council. The intent here, obviously, is to comply with the underlying zoning as required through the PUD, if that's your prerogative or your desire. Again, as Mr. MacIntyre has pointed out, the PUD section does allow you to vary the standard setbacks. Now, the big question here is is we can't tell you what the setback is for Job Point. So to error on the side of greatest caution, if you make a recommendation to approve it subject to that front setback along Lynn Street being -- being 25 feet, the standard PUD, no less than 20, we can make the plan work and forward to Council, and your recommendation then would be either be matching this plan, which is 20 feet, or we would revise the plan to show a 25-foot front setback before forwarding. Does that make sense to you as Commissioners?

MR. STANTON: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: It does, and I appreciate it. I realize we're trying to work to the greatest benefit of these homes, but if we have other new construction going in in the neighborhood, I feel there's some great benefit to the neighborhood as well if we look at the larger master plan of what's happening. I feel this allows us to take a step back and evaluate that.

MR. REICHLIN: And with that, would you care to frame a motion?

MS. LOE: So since I boondoggled this, I'd like to make a motion to approve -- in Case 15-230 -- 223, approve the request by the City of Columbia to rezone approximately .69 acres of land from PUD-4.3 to PUD-6.0, and approval of the PUD development -- are we doing both? Thank you. -- PUD development plan to be known as Linn Street Cottages with the caveat that the front setback will be revised to the standard PUD and evaluated with the Job Point setbacks --

MR. ZENNER: And be no less than 20 feet.

MS. LOE: -- and be no less than 20 feet. Thank you.

MS. BURNS: And the variance?

MR. STRODTMAN: And the side yard?

MS. LOE: And approval of a variance to allow six feet at the perimeter side line -- yards.

MS. BURNS: Second.

MR. REICHLIN: May we have a roll call, please?

MS. LOE: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing. Motion carries 7-0

MS. LOE: We have seven yeses. The motion carries. It will be -- our recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you.

Case No. 15-228

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of Tompkins Homes & Development, Inc. (owner) to rezone 7.3 acres of property from R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) to PUD-2 (Planned Unit Development) and approval of a PUD development plan to be known as "Barcus Ridge Plat 2 PUD". The subject property is located on the north side of Old Plank Road, approximately 700 feet west of Abbotsbury Lane.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends:

1. Approval of the rezoning to PUD-2 with associated Statement of Intent
2. Approval of the "Barcus Ridge" PUD Development Plan.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of staff?

MS. RUSHING: I was curious as to whether there are additional lots anticipated in the future or is this -- because of the terrain, this is it?

MR. SMITH: For this -- with the rezoning that they're requesting, they are more or less maxed out on the number of residential lots for this particular lot -- this Lot 5. So they would not be able to add any additional residential lots without coming back, conducting a new public hearing to change that zoning designation.

MS. RUSHING: And do you know the rationale for putting the drive onto Old Plank Road right there at that curve?

MR. SMITH: Yes. This is actually something that I believe you may have had discussion of this during the plat, but the traffic engineer -- the City's traffic engineer did review the plat and actually with -- along with Mr. Crockett, Crockett Engineering, to determine the best locations for the drives for, I think, all five lots. So -- and we'll actually get a little bit into it on the other one. There's -- there's some additional considerations for that. But this was reviewed by our traffic engineer and considered to be the best location for a driveway onto Old Plank. Old Plank does have some challenges, if anyone has driven down there to see it, but those sight distances were reviewed and I believe -- and maybe Mr. Crockett can speak more to that, as well, but I believe those were acceptable to City staff.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other questions of staff? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Quick question. Mr. Smith, do you know the speed limit on Old Plank Road? I mean, that would be --

MR. SMITH: I do not.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MR. SMITH: And that's a good -- it's --

MS. BURNS: I'm just wondering as I see people exiting and entering the street, how fast on traffic that's going to be going past there, their exit and entry point.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I would hate to warrant a guess, but I don't think it's 60.

MS. BURNS: Okay. And, no. I don't think it is, either.

MR. SMITH: It's probably less than that, so I -- maybe someone that is in the audience maybe here could -- could answer that, as well, but I can't answer that right now.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other -- Mr. Strodtman?

MR. STRODTMAN: A couple questions. Do we anticipate that this will always be a private street?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. There's actually a stipulation that's required to be placed on PUDs when there's a private street involved, and it states the City will not accept private streets unless they're built to City standard. And, typically, the very purpose of the private street is to build it less than the City standard as far as width goes. So unless something changes, the City would not accept the private street as a public right-of-way.

MR. STRODTMAN: As this does not meet the standard?

MR. SMITH: Correct.

MR. STRODTMAN: As it is today. My next question, there's no improvements plan for Old Plank Road for this subject -- this site. Correct?

MR. SMITH: No. Old Plank has -- there's no capital improvement program or project identified for Old Plank Road at this time, so not at least in the next ten-plus years, I think.

MR. STRODTMAN: I meant more by the applicant.

MR. SMITH: Oh, by the applicant. I don't believe there's any right-of-way or roadway improvements required for this request.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay.

MR. SMITH: Our traffic engineer did not identify any improvements that would be required.

MR. STRODTMAN: And my last question --

MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Outside of the sidewalk installation. And so there could be some grading involved, as well, for the sidewalk.

MR. STRODTMAN: My last question is -- and City staff is comfortable with the screening of those seven lots on the south side that would, you know, back up to Old Plank Road would be sufficient?

MR. SMITH: Well--

MR. STRODTMAN: I see Old Plank Road becoming a busy -- it already is, but it's going to continue to become a busier road and --

MR. SMITH: We agree. And that's something we had actually had requested from the applicant

is to add some screening. You know, if we had a solid wall, we would probably prefer that, but it's not always practical and it may not be something that can be guaranteed to be kept there by the future homeowners. So we feel like that the -- the street trees that's been shown there is a -- is a kind of a nice compromise for what we'd like to require there. So there could be additional screening there for sure, but that's what we're comfortable with recommending for the time being, so --

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Any additional questions of staff? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. CROCKETT: Commission, my name is Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 2608 North Stadium. I'd like to concur with staff that indicated this is a low-density development. We are asking for a PUD-2. We're not asking for a PUD to gain density. We're not asking to try and cram more units on there by going for a PUD. Quite the contrary. If we went for a single-family residential development, for an R-1 development that it's zoned right now, we could get more units on the piece of property. We want to -- the developer wants to limit the number of units. Ms. Rushing, to answer your question, we could add more units on the property. We could propose more units. We're not proposing those units and, therefore, we're limiting it to the 14 that we have here today. If we went the single -- single-family route, we could get more lots on there. However, we think that this development goes to the simple core of what a PUD is when it talks about encouraging grouping or clustering units and the preservation of green space and open space. By going a PUD route, as opposed to the R-1 route that it's currently zoned, it allows us to minimize the footprint or the impact on this development and it allows us to minimize grading, minimize tree clearing, minimize the overall footprint that this development is going to have on this piece of property. It allows us to open up and have additional green space. It allows us to have smaller individual lots with more common ground for all the residents to share. So we feel that's very important because, you know, we're not asking to -- and a lot times you ask for a PUD so you can get more units on a piece of property. That's not what we're asking for here. We're asking -- actually asking for less, but we're also asking for smaller footprints. In answer to some of the questions, Ms. Rushing, the location of that private drive is put there so that we can maximize our sight distance out onto Old Plank Road. We worked with the traffic engineer. He indicated that was a good location, a great location for that access point and that's what we want to go with, so that's the reason for that. Certainly, you can see the amount of additional driveway there -- or, excuse me -- private road that we have to put in. That's not advantageous to a development to have more cost, but to get the right location, the right safe location for that access, that's the reason for that. Ms. Burns talked about the speed limit. I apologize. I don't know the posted -- posted speed limit for that, either, but --

MS. BURNS: I think we have that information.

MS. LOE: Forty.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay, 40. But that's something that the traffic engineer also looked at when he allowed us or gave us specific locations where we could have access on Old Plank Road, so that's been evaluated to make sure that we have access at the appropriate location. Mr. Strodtman, to talk about the

public versus private street. Mr. Smith is correct. It cannot be a public street unless it's built to City standards. Not to say we're going to cheapen the street up. We're still going to build the same cross-section. We're going to build the same quality that the City builds their streets, but we won't have the right-of-way width that's needed to turn this over into a public street. That's part of the reason why we want to go to a PUD. We want to go with a private street so we can pull those units closer to the street, so we can minimize the impact both along Old Plank Road as well as behind it. We want to preserve those areas. It's very important to this development to do it. And then, lastly, the screening -- Mr. Strodman was talking about the screening on Old Plank Road. We're not building a sidewalk on Old Plank, we're not proposing to build it in a -- in a nonstandard location just because want to. There is a waterline that was built out there several months ago that had already cleared a path along Old Plank Road. We're going to utilize that clearing. We want to preserve the trees between the waterline and Old Plank. We don't want to clear out more trees by the -- you know, the required sidewalk only to clear out more trees. We want to preserve as many trees as we can which would enhance the screening up along Old Plank Road. So that's the reason why we're pulling the sidewalk up the hill in a nonstandard location so we can preserve the screening that's out there. So if there's any questions the Commission may have, I'm happy to answer them.

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions of this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Is there anybody else caring to comment on this matter?

MS. BURLISON: My name is Cindy Burlison; I live at 3204 Westcreek Circle. I am a homeowner north of this property. I don't know if Mr. Smith can back up. I'm at the -- I own the property at the corner of K and Sinclair just north there. Yeah. That's -- that's my -- that's my property right there. Okay. Property ownership will be listed under -- I've had a recent name change, so property ownership would be listed under the name Pepmiller, but my -- my concern in both of these developments is the increasing density of traffic in this area. I'm not opposed to the requests that are before you right now. This area is developing, but I really appreciate the Council's attention to speed limits. The posted speed limit is 40. The practiced speed limit is certainly closer to 60. And my concern, being there on the north side of K where Sinclair comes down, you can see the City park. When the Cascades was platted in '02, we were told that Sinclair would be swept over to align with Old Plank to line that intersection up. You can actually see the development of that city park there in the northeast corner where, indeed, that whole setback was made with the planning that that intersection was going to be lined up. It -- that realignment of the intersection, as I understand it, is on the seven-year roads projects list. I'm informed by the traffic engineers that it will probably be developed as a roundabout when that time comes, and that's -- and that's an appropriate plan, perhaps, the way the City is developing road right-of-ways. The density -- and this aerial photo is old. There's a lot more houses in there now and -- and you know how many of these developments are coming before you. As that -- we have got to do something with the infrastructure. I mean, we don't want to create in south Columbia what has happened in downtown Columbia by -- you know, approving and approving and approving developments without dealing with the infrastructure

questions. And so I don't stand before you opposing the PUD or the O-P request. In fact, I'm probably in favor of them. I just want it to be done with attention to that needed infrastructure and to encourage -- at what point, you know, as a citizen, I guess I have the question -- a question in my mind is why isn't the developer held responsible for upgrading the roads as they go? Why -- why the development on their property, on their lots, and then ten, fifteen, twenty, thirty years later, we, the citizens are faced with tax levies to fix the infrastructure that wasn't part of the planning. And so, that's the issue, the concern, and the reason I'm here tonight is to talk about that realignment of the Old Plank-K-Sinclair intersection because it is being drastically affected. The traffic coming south on Sinclair, especially right now with Scott Boulevard closed, I can tell you they come barreling down that hill at 70 miles an hour to that stop sign and, you know, 30 feet from my front door. So that's my concern is that -- that that intersection perhaps be expedited in getting aligned as all of this development south of K and Old Plank is happening. I'm not opposed to the development. That's a -- that's a great intersection for commercial development. And I know you're not talking about the O-P proposal yet, but it's all related, you know. In all honesty, our three and a half acres someday probably will also be commercial and -- and that's okay. So I'm in favor of the development, but let's look at that infrastructure. Let's get that -- that intersection properly aligned to handle this additional traffic that's being thrust that direction.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you. Is there anybody with a question of this speaker? Seeing no one. Thank you very much. Is there anybody else who would care to comment on this matter? Seeing no one.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. REICHLIN: Commissioners, feel free. Mr. Strodman?

MR. STRODTMAN: I have -- I have a question for staff. Just a follow up from the speaker just then. Is Sinclair and Old Plank Road, is that in the seven-year capital improvement plan?

MR. SMITH: The -- Sinclair is in the capital improvement program from Route K going north. Now whether or not any intersection improvements is included in that, I can't say for sure. I know the upgrading of Sinclair was in there, but again if that includes major intersection improvements, I'm -- I'm not aware, but it may. And she had suggested as -- as this area is developing, obviously, I think as we reevaluate that CIP every year and as traffic counts go up every year, that's something that is going to have more and more attention. Now, I can't guarantee that it'll be put on the, you know, one -- one to two year plan next year, but it's something that every time we have a development that comes through, it's probably going to be in the backs of staff's minds as far as looking at when the appropriate timing for upgrades in this area is going to be.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other comments?

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll go ahead. You know, I think -- you know, I think the PUD, they've -- you know, the applicant has done a really good job of, you know, 50 percent green space, you know, accommodating the -- the terrain, the landscaping. You know, obviously, this applicant is -- is putting in quite a bit of capital for the infrastructure of that street that, you know, is carried over quite a bit further, so, obviously, they are very considerate of safety and traffic and, you know, ingress and egress out onto Old Plank Road, so I think it's a good project and plan to support it.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else? I, too, think that it's going to be a good project. I found from personal experience that cluster housing and a PUD can be a workable scenario and it appears that they've done their due diligence in order -- in order to create not an overcrowding situation, so I, as well, plan to support this.

MR. STRODTMAN: With that, I'll make a recommendation for Case 15-228. My recommendation is for approval of rezoning 7.3 acres of property from R-1 to PUD-2, and approval of a PUD development plan to be known as Barcus Ridge PUD.

MR. STANTON: I second.

MR. REICHLIN: May we have a roll call, please?

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In the case of 15-228.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing. Motion carries 7-0.

MS. LOE: The motion carries with eight [sic] votes. It'll be forwarded to Council with recommendation for approval for their consideration.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you. Okay.

Case No. 15-229

A request by Crockett Engineer Consultants (agent) on behalf of Tompkins Homes & Development, Inc. (owner) to rezone 1.63 acres of property from R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) to O-P (Planned Office Development) and approval of an O-P development plan to be known as "Barcus Ridge Subdivision Plat 2". The subject property is located at the southwest corner of Old Plank Road and State Route K.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends:

1. Approval of the rezoning to O-P with associated Statement of Intent
2. Approval of the "Barcus Ridge" O-P Development Plan with associated design parameters.

MR. REICHLIN: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I -- I think I'm turned around here, but to the east, the little PUD section next to it, does the applicant own that property also? It's an aerial view that I'm looking at, Mr. Smith.

MS. RUSHING: Uh-huh.

MR. SMITH: Are you talking about this piece here?

MS. BURNS: Yes.

MR. SMITH: That is -- was actually dedicated as right-of-way at -- with the Plat 2 of Barcus Ridge, so it opened up the opportunity to do a much more substantial intersection improvement which the -- the property owner had agreed to to basically help realign Old Plank which -- with Sinclair here. And as the previous speaker had mentioned, this -- this area here of the park is actually right-of-way, too. So these roadways have been identified as -- as being needing to be aligned better, so this kind of opens up the

opportunity to do that improvement in the future.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other questions of staff?

MS. RUSHING: I just want to clarify, there is no access onto K. Correct?

MR. SMITH: Correct. There is no access onto K.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else? Seeing no one.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. CROCKETT: Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 2608 North Stadium. We're going to cover just a couple -- a couple items here. I think Mr. Smith did a very good job of giving an overview of this proposed O-P plan. When this originally started, my client intended to develop this as an R-1 lot with all the rest of the larger lots in Barcus Plat 2. However, given the fact that this site sits adjacent to the Cascades Arrowhead, Boone's Pointe, Oak Park, The Gates, Deerfield Ridge, and Cobblestone, there's a substantial amount of homes in this area. My client certainly had the intention of developing it as a single-family lot. However, he was approached by several other individuals who said we really don't want to drive eight miles or ten miles or twelve miles to our office every day, to go sit in an office and do our business on the internet or via phone. I want someplace close by, someplace I can bike, someplace I can walk, someplace I can get to easily within a matter of just a couple of minutes as opposed to driving ten or twelve miles to work. Given the idea that he can provide that right here, given that there's a -- you know, hundreds of homes in this -- in this area, we're simply asking for a 6,000 square foot office building. It's a very small business, a very small office, you know, given the size of the homes in the area. So we think that this is relatively appropriate for this location. It is on the corner of two major roadways. We are asking for a shared driveway with the adjacent residential lot. We think that limiting -- having two low -- low-intensity uses sharing a driveway is appropriate, even though one may be residential and one may be office, but eliminating one access point onto -- onto Old Plank Road is certainly appropriate for this location. Talk about sidewalks a little bit. The entire sidewalk across the entire north of this piece of property has already been committed to by my client to -- to construct, along with another development that he's doing in the area. His contribution, just for two bridge crossings, is over \$150,000. I think that's a little bit out of the ordinary because, typically, sidewalks don't have bridge crossings, but, in this case, along Old -- along Route K, they're going to be required. It's a substantial investment by my client, but he believes that adding sidewalks in this area is something that's -- that's needed and will be used. It will certainly complement this development with the adjacent residential uses. And with that, I'll be happy any questions that the Commission may have.

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions of this speaker? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: When this area was before us before, I was concerned and I'm still concerned about the number of driveways that eventually will be located along this rather curvy section of Old Plank Road. And I understand that there are going to be three lots between the two areas that -- that you've brought to us today. Correct? Three?

MR. CROCKETT: I believe there's two lots between -- there's this tract, there's a PUD tract, and I believe there's two lots in between.

MS. RUSHING: Just two? Three?

MR. CROCKETT: Oh, excuse me. I apologize.

MR. SMITH: Five lots total.

MR. CROCKETT: I'm being told there's three. I apologize

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: Three residential plus the other two?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. I apologize.

MS. RUSHING: So in addition to these two drives, you are planning two additional drives. And one of those lots is going to use this driveway, and other two lots are going to have their own driveways?

MR. CROCKETT: That is correct. And we have submitted a plan to the traffic engineer for the City of Columbia identifying locations -- specific locations for those driveways for the traffic engineer to review to make sure we have adequate safety getting onto Old Plank Road so we don't put them in a blind curve or at a location that's going to cause an issue. So we have submitted the exact locations that we desire to have that so -- and I believe he has reviewed and approved those locations.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: And that's kind of the reason why we would like to have a shared driveway here because, again, they're two low-intense uses. We believe that they could share a driveway and eliminate one of those connections onto Old Plank.

MR. REICHLIN: I would only comment that low impact is kind of subjective. I mean, any kind of office is going to generate a certain amount of traffic. What -- to what extent has that been reviewed?

MR. CROCKETT: I'm sorry, Mr. Reichlin?

MR. REICHLIN: Trips?

MR. CROCKETT: It depends on the end users. If you look at the allowed uses, we've eliminated a lot of the high-intense uses in an office development. What we envision here is something along the lines of an insurance agent or an engineer, an architect, something along those lines that really don't -- they don't really generate a lot of come-and-go traffic. You come in the morning, you do your business, and then you leave in the evening. So we really don't see this as a high-traffic generator. We don't see it as something that's going to generate a lot of traffic coming to the site, you know, given the location of where it's at.

MR. REICHLIN: And maybe I'm not the most forward thinker in the room, but somehow the sharing of a driveway with a -- if I'm a homeowner and I'm sharing a driveway with a -- with an office development, something about that doesn't --

MR. CROCKETT: Well, you know, we've thought about that. That was something that we wanted to propose because we think that the residential -- we own the residential lot next to us, and we -- we know that's going to be a restriction when we have to sell that lot. You know, again, it kind of goes back to

what we envision on this site as not being a high-intense use. The number of driveways has been a concern of staff for quite some time. We want to eliminate those wherever possible. And so, you know, that's -- it's something that we thought we could -- we could do. You know, we want to be a -- maybe think a little bit different on this one.

MR. REICHLIN: Well, in thinking a little bit differently, and the lot doesn't appeal to a residential end user, what's to keep that from -- are you coming back with an additional O-P plan?

MR. CROCKETT: Sure. Good point. That's an excellent point. Two things; first of all, what keeps us from coming back? Nothing keeps us coming back asking for that, but this Commission can keep us from moving forward with that. And, secondly, we've had several -- you know, I shouldn't several -- two interested parties in purchasing that lot, so we think that it does have residential value at that current location. And so, you know, it's my -- it's my belief -- I've talked to my client and again I -- we -- I can't guarantee anything, but it's my belief what we're -- what we're asking for here with the O-P as well as the PUD, we believe the residential units are going to stay intact between the two.

MS. RUSHING: And it looks like you may have some limitations from the flood plain there?

MR. CROCKETT: There is some flood plain. Correct, Ms. Rushing. A lot of the property that lies to the east of this development is in the flood plain. We had a -- the draw of the creek kind of runs through there and that kind of goes back to -- and to Ms. Burns, to your comment about the PUD area. There is a large piece of unused property over there. The City simply asked could we have that as right-of-way, so we wouldn't have to acquire temporary construction easements or additional right-of-way in the future when Sinclair and -- well, Sinclair was rerouted and have the intersection at Route K. And so my client, by all means, you know -- we're not going to use that, it's not really usable to this development. We would already have 70 percent open space, we don't need that additional property, happy to give it to the City for a right-of-way. So, you know, it does -- it does impact the property a little bit, Ms. Rushing, but it's off to the east side.

MS. RUSHING: Well, what I'm seeing, and I could be wrong, looks to be the --

MR. CROCKETT: It -- well --

MS. RUSHING: -- the east -- yeah. The eastern portion of your part, yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: Right. The eastern portion of the site. Now, the flood plain does run through the building, if you notice the flood plain itself. But if you look at the base flood elevation in that area, it's substantially below what the -- what the -- what the flood plain is showing on the map. That map -- what is shown there is what has come from the FEMA map. It may not coincide necessarily with the elevations in the field. It's -- it's kind of hard to explain, but we certainly will not have any flood-plain implications. We will be well above the flood plain as stated by FEMA.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other questions of this speaker?

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Seeing none. Thank you. Anybody else who would care to comment on this matter, feel free.

MS. IBDAH: Hello. My name is Robin Ibdah, and I live at 6950 South Arrowhead, so I'm within

200 feet of the proposed office building, and I am opposed to it. K will not be able to support any more traffic. Those people have not moved in yet and it's already -- they've had to lower the speed limit and traffic has increased probably fivefold. It's out of conformity with the rest of the buildings there. It's all residential, and I just don't see that it would add any value to any neighborhoods in the area, including the one that the developer is building. So I'm opposed to it being rezoned to the planned -- to the office space. I don't mind it being residential, but I really don't feel that it can support an office space. And he may say that it's going to architects and things like that, but they're going to lease it to whoever will pay the rent. And five years down the line, who knows what will be in that space? And K, the homes are built right up to the edge. I don't know how K is ever going to be expanded without basically being in somebody's backyard. So I'm opposed to it for those reasons.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of this speaker?

MS. BURNS: I have one. Have you had a chance to talk with the developer and express --

MS. IBDAH: No.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MS. IBDAH: Huh-uh.

MS. BURNS: And that -- okay.

MS. IBDAH: No. Thank you.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else? Thank you very much. Anybody else who cares to comment on this matter, feel free.

MS. BURLISON: My name is Cindy Burlison; I live at 3204 Westcreek Circle. I'm a homeowner at 6991 South Sinclair Road. You all know where I live, up north of this. I am not opposed to the commercial development at this intersection. I think in the long-term future of the southwest corridor around Columbia, I think we all can see the Scott Boulevard-Route K circuit developing. I remember well when the dynamite was being blown every night at 5:00 to put Stadium through to four lanes, and so -- I am concerned about the sidewalk placement and, I guess, I would suggest that the developer on this lot be held to the standard of putting the sidewalk all the way down Old Plank to the existing -- through the existing corridor of the public right-of-way to -- straight to the city park. I don't know why we would deviate from that. The city park is down right at the intersection of Old Plank and K. I don't -- I guess I don't understand why we're not -- or why we wouldn't require the sidewalk to stay along the street frontage down to the intersection. And again, just for the record -- the official record on this request before the Commission, I would say that the development and realignment of that intersection of K, Sinclair, and Old Plank be a higher priority as these continued higher-density developments are approved. It is becoming a critical issue in that area. That's all.

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions of this speaker? Seeing no one. Thank you very much, ma'am. Anybody else care to comment on this matter, feel free to come forward.

MR. PEPMILLER: I'm Craig Pepmiller, residing at 600 Hulen Drive, co-owner of the 6991 Sinclair property, so that's right at the corner. I really appreciate the developer's look at this for -- especially the

flood and creek area and keeping that a -- an easement that the City is going to have to deal with somehow at some point. I am in favor of this. There is no question that Route K is not going to be a larger street improved, a major thoroughfare through the area, just need to put the planning into that, including the planning of the alignment of -- of Sinclair and Old Plank. So I just wanted to get out there that, yes, there are some concerns with density along Route K, but that's not going to be solved by restricting the further development along K because it's going to happen. It's -- that would be alleviated by expanding K, which I think is already in your plans. Thank you so much.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of this speaker? Seeing no one. Thank you very much.

MS. PEPMILLER: I apologize again. I'm Cindy Pepmiller -- Cindy Burlison now -- previous name Pepmiller. Addressing the question about the FEMA flood plain, as it is shown here, and Mr. Crockett is correct. These elevations don't match the FEMA maps. We bought that property just north of K at 6991 Sinclair Road in July of 1993, and moved into it at the height of the big 500-year flood. Our property north of K is also shown being in the FEMA maps. At that time, we hired an engineer who did an engineering study on the property, which is essentially the same elevation as this, and it was found to lie outside of the 500-year flood plain. We have never been required to own flood insurance on our -- on our property north of K, so these -- these lots stay dry as -- as it pertains to a flood plain. There's obviously drainage issues if you don't get your land graded properly, but it's not in the flood plain.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else caring to comment on this matter? Seeing no one.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. REICHLIN: Commissioners, your thoughts? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I was wondering if Mr. Smith could address the issue -- I have a question about the sidewalk.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. The sidewalks. I may have kind of maybe caused some confusion, but the sidewalk, they are required to construct the sidewalk all the way along their property lines. And actually you could see here, it extends beyond that. Even though they've dedicated some right-of-way, I believe it's going to extend to the -- to the intersection and on the east side is the Cobblestone Cottages development, which is also constructing sidewalks, so there should be sidewalks on both sides of the south side of Route K.

MS. LOE: And along Old Plank?

MR. SMITH: Correct. And what -- what's different here is instead of along Old Plank, instead of the sidewalk coming this way and then crossing the river and coming here, you just come a little farther down and, basically, avoid the crossing, so I think they're trying to consolidate the crossings at this point. So they realigned it a little bit, but it does serve the same purpose.

MS. LOE: It does, though I think the speaker did have a good point in that we have a city park at that intersection, and that is one of the things we're trying to align our pedestrian multimodal network toward. So if people are coming back from the park up Old Plank, I'm just wondering if that's the most intuitive direction that they're going to go or if they will walk on Old Plank.

MR. SMITH: Do you want to address it?

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. Ms. Loe, I would like to address that comment a little bit. Again, we talked about the drainage structures that are extremely expensive to construct.

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. CROCKETT: They're also extremely expensive to maintain, and they'll be on -- on the public side once they're constructed and accepted. So the intent here is to provide connectivity -- pedestrian connectivity onto Old Plank Road and The Gates and all the development to the south directly to that park. So you'll see how we kind of come across, we're going to utilize the two -- the two bridge structures that -- there's one right there, Mr. Smith, and the other one is right there. If we came along Old Plank Road, we would construct one additional elevated bridge structure, and it would be larger than the two that we're currently constructing. And so the idea there is to minimize cost now, as well as to minimize maintenance costs in the future is to bring the sidewalk directly north and tie into the sidewalk along Route K. If you lived in the development to the south, you're going to go from the park along Old Plank Road in a westerly fashion. Whether you go in a westerly fashion along Old Plank Road or you go on a westerly fashion along a portion of Route K and then south, you're still going to go in a westerly fashion. You're still going to cover the same amount of ground, and so you're not going to backtrack, you're not going to go one direction just to turn around and go back the other way. So we feel that what we're proposing is -- is basically it serves the exact same purpose. The only residents that wouldn't have that -- have that luxury would be the residents in the Cobblestone development which is to the east. They're going to be right across the street -- right across the street -- right across Route K from the park anyway, so they're not going to utilize any such sidewalk on the west side of -- of Old Plank as it is. So we feel that every resident will still cover the same amount of ground, the same distance, but we just minimize costs now, or reduce costs now as well as in the future.

MR. SMITH: And I might point out, everything here is actually dedicated as right-of-way now, so if they constructed it as what -- what would typically be seen, they -- they would bring it here and bring it all the way back down here, and at some point, the realignment will bring the road up through here for -- for a roundabout. So putting a sidewalk, it looks like maybe generally in this location is probably not as offset for what it would be in the future, which is, you know, likely, the crossing would be in this area, as it would be if it was -- it was out here in this location, if that makes sense. So I think it's closer to what it would most likely be in the future, but not perfectly aligned with -- with what the future would be, but it probably wouldn't be constructed that way if they did it the other way, either. So it's -- it's not a perfect, I think, location either way they do it, but this one keeps it from actually being tore up in the future when we actually do the intersection improvement, hopefully. So it will not be an infrastructure that we need to replace at some point.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Okay. So any other -- any other comments of Commissioners? Mr. Strodtman? Go ahead.

MR. STRODTMAN: You know, I think it's a -- it's a -- it's an appropriate use for the area. I

believe that there is a demand for office space -- you know, it's not going to be a convenience store. It's -- you know, the -- the statement of intent has a pretty specific list of uses that could be allowed in there and, you know, by looking at them, they're all a fairly low density use. And I agree that, you know, our model is to have communities that you don't have to travel, you know, 15 to 20 miles out of your community to work and to, you know, do some business from a retail standpoint or from a business standpoint, so I think it's a very applicable use and I think it'll be space that will be leased very quickly from an office standpoint because people don't want to have to drive downtown or to east side or west side or wherever they -- wherever they might have to go to find an office use. And right on this corner and especially with the improvements that are going to happen at Sinclair, I don't think any residential would really want to be that close to that interchange in a future date, so I think it's a very applicable use for the area, so I plan on supporting it.

MR. REICHLIN: Anyone else? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: And I do appreciate the speaker who was concerned about the office development. I would like to think that the applicant building homes in that area, that he wants to sell and would develop this area in an appropriate and attractive manner because it would behoove him to do that. It wouldn't be sensible to put something there that would be unattractive and cause a problem for the homeowners there.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else? I would just like to say that, in my view, it's a proposition that's somewhat ahead of its time. And in that that it is somewhat ahead of its time, we really don't have a good sense of what will work in the area. And in that regard, it's not my intention to support this at this time. Would anybody care to frame a motion? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Stanton.

MR. REICHLIN: Go ahead.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 15-229, I move to approve the rezoning from R-1 to O-P with the Statement of Intent and approve the Barcus Ridge O-P Development Plan with associated design parameters.

MS. LOE: I'll second. Roll call?

MR. REICHLIN: Good idea.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing. Voting No: Mr. Reichlin. Motion carries 6-1

MS. LOE: The vote carries 6-1. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to Council for their consideration.

MR. REICHLIN: If we can request a five-minute break. Five-minute break recess before we go into the plan?

MS. LOE: Do you want to announce it louder?

MR. REICHLIN: There will be a five-minute recess.

(Off the record)

MR. REICHLIN: Okay. We'll go ahead and reassemble at this time and continue on with the next

item on the agenda.

Case No. 15-38

A request by the City of Columbia for approval of a new neighborhood plan entitled "West Central Columbia Neighborhood Plan." The planning is bounded by West Broadway on the south, Stadium Boulevard on the west, I-70 Drive Southeast on the north, and Sexton Road and McBaine Avenue on the east.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Steve MacIntyre of the Planning and Development Department.

Staff recommends adoption of the West Central Columbia Neighborhood Action Plan.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of staff regarding this matter?

MR. STANTON: I do.

MR. REICHLIN: Mr. Stanton, go right ahead.

MR. STANTON: I have a question for staff. Basically, we're saying that this is an organic document. It's a living, breathing document. What are the procedures for making changes to the -- to an adopted neighborhood plan? Let's say as this grows and as we execute this plan, we kind of hopefully learn as we move along and then we want to make changes or add or subtract or refocus on different things. What is the process in doing that and keeping teeth in the document? How -- how -- what procedures do we have in place?

MR. MACINTYRE: Well, the process for changing the plan would probably result from Council requesting staff that they take it back likely the Commission for consideration. Now, it depends on the type of change, I think, as to what that specific process would be or how it's --

MR. STANTON: Well, I'm saying -- let's say the neighborhood associations, as we use this plan, it's going to change, hopefully. If it's an organic document, it's -- you know, it moves with the times. Do we have anything in place that will let it grow from the ground up as the neighborhood associations or the neighborhoods or homeowner's association caucus, they want something else added or subtracted from the document, do we have a process in place that send those changes up the ladder or have -- have we got that far yet?

MR. MACINTYRE: Certainly, staff could work with those neighbors to identify changes if it's determined that they're needed and present them to the Council for -- or the Commission and Council for consideration. I believe that the plan is broad enough in most instances that unless there were a major turnaround on certain recommendation within the plan to where, you know, what we believe now is -- is not at all accepted in the future, I think that it's unlikely to be needed. However, if there were a major change, something that really just is decided down the road is out of place or no longer relevant or desired, that could be brought to the Council and the plan could be amended or updated, perhaps.

MR. STANTON: Oh, it has to come through staff. Let me give you an example. Let's say when we were working on ADUs, Benton-Stephens as a collective did not really want ADUs in the neighborhood. Say they say, hey, we're missing out. We won't accept ADUs in our overlay or our -- say

their neighborhood plan. So they bring that to you and then you take it up. Do you see what I'm saying? I want to -- I want to hear -- I want to hear -- and that's -- if we're not there. If we're not there, then that's fine, too. But how do we make this document breathe once it's accepted, because this next step from here is Council. Correct?

MR. MACINTYRE: As a guiding document, the -- there is a degree of flexibility in how it's interpreted and applied. And I think the main thing to remember is that this isn't a binding legal document. It doesn't act as an ordinance. So if there was a recommendation in here that doesn't provide enough flexibility to accommodate a certain type of development, for example, that may feel as if it's appropriate, that may fit into the neighborhood and may be supported by the neighbors, and your Commission, as well as Council, there really is the ability to alter or to still support that request despite it perhaps not matching exactly with the plan. The key thing that the plan offers, the most important thing that it offers is that guidance on the front end to help direct future land use and development, you know, to help steer the ship in the general direction that we want to see it going and -- and that, I think, is the most important thing.

MR. ZENNER: I think, Mr. Stanton, to get at your primary question, if there is an objective that the plan proposes at this point that the citizens, the Council, or the Commission do not agree with, the process by which to amend that would be to have it come back before -- even if staff is still behind that, it needs to be presented, like any other text change, any other amendment to a document. As Steve has pointed out, the planning document is a guide. And if we want to make sure that that guide provides the right direction, not having superfluous material in it or extra material in it that has been discounted by those that are affected by that, and you want it amended or the public would want it amended, the process to correct a plan that has been adopted as a guiding tool is to have that expressed to the Commission, the Commission can then either direct staff to request Council to amend, or the Commission can request Council to amend to remove that. That process, however, requires coming back through a public engagement, like we have done to draft the plan, to ensure that what is maybe being sensed by one select group or maybe a collection of groups is, in fact, real. It's not one or two individuals that are just frustrated by a standard. The effort that we have gone through as a staff to produce the document here through the engagement has been significant, and the ideas are founded within the goals and the objectives of Columbia Imagined generally. Change creates -- change creates fear. We have change being suggested here, which is different from what exists within the current environment. Fear of the unknown is something that has an impact on how people react to new ideas. However, the only thing that is certain is change and change has to be permitted, but change has to also be permitted within the general guidelines of what would be considered acceptable. Right now, this plan offers guidance to what has generally been considered acceptable, generally considered consistent with the comprehensive plan adopted by City Council and asked by City staff to implement. If we have to change direction, we change direction. And that requires going back through a public process to do so because you'll have people that support the plan as its written today and may feel disheartened if it's changed because it doesn't then include what they supported. So we have to come back through that process, but it can occur by an individual coming to us, coming to the Commission, going to Council, going to their Council representative. The point has to

be, the problem has to be pointed out, and we have to be made aware of it. Ignoring elements of the plan is not something that we want to do. The plan acts as a guide. It acts as an evaluator of proposals. The issue that we have with many plans -- and I can refer to the Charrette Plan that we have adopted by H3 until it was actually accepted by City Council as a guiding document, it was just a plan. It had very little weight as it related to any type of evaluation. That was a great frustration, as you all are aware. So what we will do here is we will use this plan to the extent that it can be used to guide decision-making, but if those decisions are compromised or are believed to be inappropriate, we need to change the plan. We need to reflect to those change conditions and the plan needs to reevaluate the direction. Again, it is not regulatory by any means. It is discretionary at yours and Council's level to apply, but we don't go into these efforts lightly, and that's one reason why we would hold to the plan's content till told otherwise to ignore it.

MS. LOE: We were just reviewing some of the proposed code changes for subdivisions, I believe. And one of those said that there did -- there was a requirement to be aligned with the plan?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. Subdivision -- new subdivision development -- the way that it is written in the --

MS. LOE: Is this a plan that new subdivisions would be required to align with or which plan are we --

MR. ZENNER: Let me -- let me -- let me back up there.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: The UDO makes reference in a number of locations -- our Unified Development Ordinance, what we are working on, it is a comprehensive revision to both our zoning and our subdivision codes that control development within the City of Columbia, makes reference to acknowledging that the City has adopted a citywide comprehensive plan guiding growth, trying to fulfill goals and objectives. It applies not only at the land-use stage; i.e., zoning, it also applies at the stage of subdivision development because there are objectives that are laid out in the comprehensive plan as it relates to subdivisions, land preservation, cluster housing, and a variety of other environmental type related matters. So the plan, as we were going over it tonight, or the UDO, or the point that I failed to make clearly is it puts a subdivider on notice that the City has an adopted comprehensive plan. And as an individual wanting to subdivide or improve your land, you need to be aware of that. You need to look at its goals and its objectives. The West Central Neighborhood Area Plan is an amendment, is an addendum to the adopted Columbia Imagined.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: It therefore by reference becomes a piece that we use as part of our evaluation toolbox. We look at how is that development consistent. And in many respects, if we're looking at those neighborhood intersections or the nodal locations, we have to determine, one, is it consistent with the ideas of our zoning, does it fulfill the neighborhood plan objectives in creating mixed use, and then if you just happen to hit the trifecta and decide you want to do subdivision at the same time, does it meet some of our subdivision goals. I mean, it is -- it is a layered approach, and without creating documents such as

this, we give less protection or less guidance to those that are actually interested in developing their land. And I stopped when I said protection because again when people think protection, they think regulatory oversight. This is a guide. It expresses what those residents that participated in this process want to see their area develop as. It's a heck of a lot better than not having anything, but it maybe does not go as far as some would like.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any other questions of staff at this time? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I have several questions. You mentioned participation by residents of the area. Were there particular areas that had more people who were interested in -- in the process than others?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. Following our initial recommendations back in April -- yes, April -- we had mostly turnout of opponents from the Gary Street area. We've now got a Gary Street or a Gary-Atkins Neighborhood Association in that area, and actually that's partly as a result of some of the threatening recommendations in our earlier draft bringing those people together and organizing them. You know, we also encouraged them to organize because we like neighborhood associations in the City. It helps us to engage with those folks and identify issues of concern to them, provides a common contact that we can then engage with and disseminate information and have these valuable conversations regarding planning items and projects. The other area that we had the opportunity to engage with over the summer was north of that on North Clinkscales Street including Spencer and Hunt Avenue, so it was about a three-block area. Between those two groups of neighbors, we identified several issues of concern and methods to correct them which we then incorporated into the plan by changing our future land-use map designations to suit their particular concerns or address their particular concerns about what was being proposed in the earlier spring draft.

MS. RUSHING: And those are handled in the special planning areas; is that correct?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. We've identified them as special planning areas for discussion purposes. And I -- I should add that the -- the Gary-Atkins Street area, a special area summarizes the discussions that have taken place to date in that area. It should be noted, though, that some of those discussions are ongoing. And now that we've got the -- those neighbors involved or they've become involved themselves, we've been working with them. Staff, I should say, has been working with them to provide them with the information that they need and support to try to encourage appropriate compromises and solutions to their varying land-use interests. Particularly in the Gary-Atkins neighborhood, we had three distinctive groups, stakeholders with three different interests. We had those who were interested in maintaining single-family character, another stakeholder is interested in expanding an apartment complex, and another stakeholder who is amassing land with the interest of future mixed-use development. So that is a very interesting area, but we have encouraged and seen some success in negotiations and discussions between those stakeholders toward finding a middle ground or a compromise that they can all live with and be satisfied with.

MS. RUSHING: And the accessory dwelling units are currently allowed in R-2; is that correct?

MR. MACINTYRE: That's correct.

MS. RUSHING: And this proposal is to also allow them in R-1?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. That was a very popular desire of the neighbors to, you know, first of all, down-zone to R-1 in order to protect single-family character, prevent duplexes, namely, but also with that there were many neighbors who expressly indicated an interest in maintaining that ability to, at some point, construct an accessory dwelling unit on their property. So I think there were a lot of people that clearly were -- are interested in maintaining that option and we've identified a -- a means where a few different alternative options by which that might be facilitated.

MS. RUSHING: And my understanding is for these ADUs, the only additional requirements that -- that wouldn't be required of a regular house are a maximum of 800 square feet?

MR. MACINTYRE: That's correct. Accessory dwelling units are limited in their square footage or, as you mentioned, 800 square feet, or as a percentage of the principal dwelling unit, so no greater than 75 percent of the principal single-family home on a property.

MS. RUSHING: And a minimum 2,500 square feet lot area for each unit?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yeah. You -- you would need to have a 5,000 square foot lot in order to pursue an accessory dwelling unit, so yes. That would be -- work out to 2,500 square feet of lot area per unit.

MS. RUSHING: And if these are allowed in R-1 districts, will it just be in this neighborhood or throughout Columbia?

MR. MACINTYRE: That depends on what method is pursued in moving forward with accommodating accessory dwelling units in -- in an R-1 district. If it -- if it's pursued as an amendment to the R-1 district, if Council feels that that's appropriate, it may be requested that accessory -- or that the R-1 district is amended to allow, for example, accessory dwelling units as a condition use, in which case there would be still some review by the Board of Adjustment on a case-by-case basis to ensure a context appropriate situations exist prior to approving ADUs. However, the option that's mainly expressed in the West Central Plan would be to have ADUs or would be to implement an overlay district over the -- those areas identified for down-zoning or preservation of single-family housing, which could incorporate the ability for accessory dwelling units to be maintained despite the zoning being reduced to the R-1 district, so it could add that option to the R-1 district as an overlay zoning designation, in addition to likely or the suggestion rather that certain architectural and design-related elements be considered for inclusion in that overlay district.

MS. RUSHING: Okay. That was going to be another question, so I'll go to it now. Explain a little bit about overlay districts and what -- say, an area of this neighborhood wanted an overlay district, what would be involved in accomplishing that?

MR. MACINTYRE: Well, we see overlay districts in existence in the East Campus and the Benton-Stephens neighborhoods. What they have accomplished, particularly in Benton-Stephens, I think it's a noteworthy example that might be emulated or certain elements of that might be desired to be emulated in this area. The Benton-Stephens neighborhood includes provisions on spacing of single-family units, landscaping, parking, architectural design requirements to ensure a consistent look or at least, you know, basic single-family characteristics are maintained on new developments of residential nature within

that area. One of the key features that is suggested in this plan would be ensure that -- that any new residential structures maintain frontage or an entrance and windows facing the street so that the buildings address the street as opposed to putting a side, a blank wall on the street side of a building.

MS. RUSHING: Is it a mechanism that could be used in lieu of down-zoning? In other words, if you have an R-2 district, you could say it's still R-2, but no more?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes, I believe it could be used that way.

MS. RUSHING: Duplexes, everything want from -- if -- if you're redeveloping, it would be single-family residential?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. Yes, ma'am. The -- the overlay districts have the opportunity to modify the existing underlying zoning designation either by adding features or -- or relaxing those requirements so it can make it more restrictive in some ways and less restrictive in others, so it does have that ultimate flexibility.

MR. ZENNER: Ms. Rushing, what I would like to point out, however, using an overlay in a restrictive nature is not how overlays have been used generally in the City of Columbia. You would actually -- if you applied an overlay to a particular area that wanted to down-zone that is currently entitled, legally entitled to two-family development, and restrict it to single-family development only, the likelihood potentially of that being able to be sustained through a Council process, because it is a land-use restriction, a significant reduction in the value of one's property, may be very challenging, which we would probably want to go in the opposite direction to establish an overlay that took those down-zoned to get to the actual physical use of the property, not what is consistent with the zoning or the zoning that is today, that was not necessarily -- it was applied in a blanket effort, but the uses, as Steve pointed out, have not changed. So to bring the zoning back to what actually physically exists and hasn't changed since most of this area was developed is the more appropriate land-use technique. But because you, through that process, eliminate uses that they currently are entitled to, you use the overlay to add them back in.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: That would be -- you're not going to want to go in the opposite direction of trying to take away uses that somebody has a right to through an overlay -- very odd. If you restricted -- that's actually -- that would probably be considered inverse condemnation on a property. It could be. That was a \$10 legal word that I didn't probably need to use, but, nonetheless, it's one of the -- that's not something that we want to try to deal with. You want to get it probably the lowest common denominator and that is is the R-1.

MS. RUSHING: And then allow the R-2 with --

MR. ZENNER: And allow -- allow the one piece of the R-2 to creep back in. But in order to do that, as Steve has pointed, and this plan points out, there is a give and take associated with that because, obviously, it's character. It's character preservation, it's character protection. And while the density is not -- the density is not the enemy here. It's the perceived enemy, I believe. It's the design that is truly the enemy. And the way to be able to deal with the enemy that's design is to look at how to you add provisions in that correct that and address it. The overlay has that opportunity. It's -- it's, as I said tonight

in work session, the carrot and the stick.

MS. RUSHING: Okay. And then the last question: The cottage clusters, as we saw earlier, the cottage cluster that the City of Columbia is doing, they're going to maintain ownership of the common area, but that wouldn't be true of these cottage clusters that you're talking about. Correct?

MR. MACINTYRE: Not necessarily. It's -- it's something that's encouraged in the plan; however, it wouldn't necessarily be a requirement, so that would be on a case-by-case basis. The plan, again, can only make the suggestion that this is what's desired. We would like to see this. However --

MS. RUSHING: Yeah. What I'm getting at is, I have two lots and I am wanting to put four of these units on those two lots. Then what mechanism is there for all of these shared driveways and yards? How would that occur? Are -- is there going to have to be a homeowner's association for that cottage cluster?

MR. MACINTYRE: There may other creative ways to develop the same concept or layout without following that exact -- the exact model that we looked at earlier tonight by use of easements or other -- other provisions or -- to, you know, support that. However, I mean, that would be something that would need to be addressed, I think, on a case-by-case basis and --

MR. ZENNER: Again, I think, as we discussed in work session this evening, the idea or the concept of design modifications as it relates to the subdivision standards, to Ms. Loe's point earlier, we would evaluate such a request not only against this area plan's recommendation of supporting cluster housing as an alternative. That is supported through the plan, through the comprehensive plan in general. Modifications to our standard subdivision process to create frontage for legal lot frontages which would, in the instance of the City's project on Lynn Street, given the fact that we have got in essence one commonly owned parcel that has roadway frontage and then potentially four pad sites inside that, it becomes a tool that has to be better articulated with a set of standards unique to maybe that product type. And not having had an opportunity to see how these evolve, it's difficult for us to explain, I think, at this juncture what -- what it would take through the way of a series of design modifications or other modifications as it relates to lot width requirements that we may have in the zoning ordinance based on that district. Currently, the only way you can do this inside the City is as our Lynn Street project came forward. It has to be done as a planned unit development because it's the only type of project that allows you to place multiple structures on a single tract of land in the configuration that was proposed this evening. I think ultimately what we would prefer to do as a staff and I think what the consultant would like us as a community to do is avoid the use of a planned district whenever possible and be able to try to accommodate alternative development in a manner that we can accommodate it within our current structure, our current zoning structure. That requires a little bit more deep thought and -- because we have to look at what are all of the other factors. You end up with -- you end up with utility issues that we create as a part of trying to create multiple units on a single lot, and all of these other -- there's a cascading series of events that we have to, through evaluations of real projects, we have to look at, and we have to look to find out how do you resolve those. Double-frontage lots may not be a problem. You take utilities in from both sides and we have an opportunity to create a cluster development on two lots that are double frontage. A lot, however,

that backs up to something that doesn't have another frontage on it, that's a little bit more challenging, but I don't think it's something that we couldn't overcome. We just have to have time to think of what the standards are that we would need to apply.

MR. REICHLIN: I'm going to interject here and suggest that we should go forward with the public hearing.

MS. RUSHING: I'm -- I'm through anyway. That was my last question.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you. So, with that, I am going to open this up -- this matter regarding the West Central Neighborhood Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. REICHLIN: In getting started, we're going to make a -- I'm going to make a couple small suggestions that our protocol is to limit comments to three minutes. I will be tracking that. If you see the little red light blink, that means that you're either approaching or have gone over, so we would appreciate the consideration of trying to wrap up your comments at such time. With that, welcome to the podium. Whoever would like to take the first stab on it, let's go.

MS. BOLLI: My name is Ivy Bolli; I live at 307 Alexander Avenue. At the time that this began, I was the president of the West Ash Neighborhood Association. Thank you, Steve and Rachel, very much for all of your work. You haven't heard me? Okay. So I -- I have a few things. I think, in general, the plan is a marvelous plan. It has a few shortcomings, but in general, I think that we can overcome them. I think that part of the shortcoming is sort of the shortcomings that we have in the center city is that there are no sidewalks and the stormwater is a problem. And these are not issues that are a part of the neighborhood planning, but they are something to keep in -- in mind when we're thinking about the -- the overview of what we're trying to do within West Ash -- West Central Neighborhood Association. The -- then I -- that is just about everything that I wanted to say. Okay. Do you have any questions?

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions of this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MS. BOLLI: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else caring to comment on this matter?

MR. FENSTER: I'm Howard Fenster; I live at 1314 Gary Street. I am not representing the Gary-Atkins Neighborhood Association. I'm speaking as an individual, although I am -- I have participated in the Gary-Atkins neighborhood meetings. Echoing Ivy's comments, I applaud the monumental effort of City staff. Steve's conscientiousness, his patience. he's obviously studied a great deal of stoic philosophy and -- and -- and follows the Buddha, with all that he has had to put up with. And keep in mind, I come -- I still am rather agnostic toward the whole process. I've said I'm agnostic in the details of the plan. My neighbors, my friends, they were the ones who were very attached to home ownership and making sure that home ownership would be the anchor of the integrity of the neighborhood, and particularly the single-family option, and that that would basically keep the neighborhood from being in decline because of transitory populations and also landowners who would maybe not even live in the neighborhood and would not be invested in it. One of the -- the wonderful things about it is that as I was drawn into the process, I was able to contribute actively to it. Steve met with us in small groups. There was a lot of hemming and

hawing and digestion going on, and -- and, you know, I warmed to the idea that this is a good thing, you know. This is a way for democracy to happen rather than passive voting. So I think that you folks, as a Commission, should applaud the staff, and also pay attention to the good work that they have done in trying to bring different stakeholders together to speak with -- to each other in -- in a decent and mature way. And -- and while we might not all agree on the details, I think overall the process is worthwhile, and my hope would be is that we continue that process.

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions of this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Anybody else caring to comment?

MS. FERRILL: Hello. My name is Sara Ferrill; I live at 501 West Ash. In the spirit of transparency, I think it's only fair to also let you know, as president of the West Ash Neighborhood Association, I'm not speaking for the association as a whole, but rather people and stakeholders who have come to me. Secondly, I think it's only fair to tell you that I am a code enforcement specialist for the City of Columbia. That said, moving forward, I applaud the work and the massive undertaking that the staff in Planning and Development have under -- have gone through to present and put this plan together. There have been a number of times where the residents have come to me with their concerns and I then forwarded that over to Steve or to Pat, and they responded positively. An example of -- of the way that this was amended is the fact that we were -- some of the residents discussed that they were upset about that the cost associated with down-zoning. They also discussed that they were maybe not happy with -- they would have to have five neighbors or four neighbors. And so, as a result, I want to -- I want to applaud them for maintaining the fluidity of this document and maintaining the constant contact with our neighborhood association. That said, I am myself the vice-president of -- I am myself -- I myself and Rob Rasmussen, the vice-president, want to say that we are in favor of this plan. Moving forward, we hope that the citizens will remain as engaged that they have continued to be, and we see this as a roadmap that will give future stakeholders and people making financial decisions a guide as to where the money can best be spent and where attention for our needs can best be placed. Moving forward, I do think that -- I think that it should be well known that there are people in our community that are working on an overlay. We see it as a way to protect the -- the people in our neighborhood from the outside interests of developers who maybe would not be -- who wouldn't have the spirit of the neighborhood in -- in mind when they're coming in and they're purchasing blocks of land. We see this document again as a fluid document and really look forward to seeing it being implemented, not only in our neighborhoods and preserving the characteristic, but also in my job. It's also going to make prioritizing where we spend our time and our resources easier, as well. I will say we spend a lot of time in this neighborhood enforcing violations, and it is, unfortunately, an aging -- an aging neighborhood. There are -- there are portions of the neighborhoods that are degrading, and they're degrading because of resource -- maybe the resources aren't there, or an aging population that can't take care of it. And I see this plan as a way that we can implement our resources moving forward and ensuring that these residents are protected from people who would seek to -- to take advantage of them and their age. And I'm happy to answer any questions anybody has.

MR. REICHLIN: Do we have any questions of this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very

much. Anybody else -- anybody else in the audience caring to comment on this matter, we would be happy to have you approach.

MS. GARDENER: Good evening. My name is Christine Gardener; I live at 112 Anderson Avenue. I, myself, was concerned with the process from the very beginning. I have a very different take than the one on the slide of public input and feedback. There were a number of things that were troubling to me, the number of people that showed up at the meetings, the number -- I -- there are 4,760 people in that area. I don't think more than a few hundred actually were in contact with this process. I didn't see the diversity showing up at these meetings. I think the meetings were difficult and there weren't -- there was a missed opportunity to have a real community-building spirit build from the ground up where people could have gotten together in small groups and gotten engaged and then joined into a larger effort that would have really sparked, I think, a lot of community development and community building in these -- in these blocks. Major concern is the down-zoning. And one thing that I think I would like considered is that the Council be asked to reverse that 1957 decision that we could back to R-1 instead of individually trying to piecemeal R-1 into this area. It's not just a question of the money, which is a concern. They would still have to pay ads. Everyone had to pay an ad. It's the time spent -- the staff time spent. The, you know, onus being put on people who are perhaps working two jobs. These are the low-income neighborhoods. So I -- I really feel that that would be the most fair and just way of doing it. Very concerned about the up-zoning for mixed-use corners that, if we could see that slide, if you will notice, those streets that are going to be designated with the mixed-use circles, those are the only thoroughfares between I-70 Drive to the north and Stadium really, because nobody can go east-west through the whole Rollins area. So if you're going to put a bunch of businesses along those circles, I don't see how the traffic can handle it and I don't see the in and out, you know, of the cars going in and out. I just don't see how that can really work. It's going to probably cause worse traffic problems along Ash, Worley, and Broadway. Big proponent of this plan of density and infill, and I want to say I am not opposed to change and I'm not afraid of change. But we need to do this with some real carefulness because what I'm seeing here is there's no teeth on any of this. So on page 18 and 19, the planned improvements, there's a list of them and there's the thin little list. Nothing on the sidewalks where -- there's talk of bringing it up into priority, but really sidewalks are wonderful and I would be happy for sidewalks, but what about the storm and sewer systems? What about the telephone poles that are rotting in this area? We really need something that states a level of services that are necessary before we have any further infill and development so that we know how much the system can handle and how much infill we can provide without even worse problems developing. So I'm trying to wrap it up. I know the little light went off, but this is my neighborhood. I've lived here 30 years. I would appreciate a little extra time. The whole issue of affordable housing on page 34, I don't see how that's going to happen without an affordable housing policy. Recommendations, suggestions, voluntary requests are not going to cut it. It has to be policy decisions that are going to really make sure that this goes in the direction that staff and we all want. We all want a nice livable neighborhood. For example, your priorities, page 44 to 46, number 7 is infrastructure. It should be number 1. If -- the focus on the second slide that was shown tonight, the second slide said focus number 2, infrastructure. There is

nothing in here addressing that for real. The implementation, 48 and 49, who is going to do that? Who is going to be watching all the building permits to make sure that they're following the plan? Who is going to be driving this? Once again, we're not making salary, we're just the neighbors. Please help us out here. We cannot, without teeth in this thing, do it ourselves. So I've skipped a bunch of stuff. I'm summing up, but I do feel like this was a great opportunity that's so far been squandered. I still think it could happen, and I say let's meet back here in five years. How much will my neighborhood have changed in five years with this plan the way it is without any teeth? Will it be a document that we can still say is working for us? Five years, I've seen massive changes in Columbia in five years in certain areas. Thank you very much. Any questions?

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Anybody else caring to comment on this matter this evening. Seeing no one.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Chairman, before you close the public hearing, I would like to read comments that we did receive from a member of the public that was unable to attend that had asked that his comments be read into the public record for this evening, and to do so, I believe, would be appropriate. His comments will be forwarded -- his written comments will be forwarded to the City Council along with the Council report, but out of respect for the request, if you do not mind --

MR. REICHLIN: I don't --

MR. ZENNER: -- I will read Mr. John Clark's comments into the public records as they relate to the West Central Columbia Neighborhood Action Plan. It starts, Comments on the West Central Columbia Neighborhood Draft Plan, originally drafted April 2015 and updated in November 2015. During the recent First Ward Council race, I talked with a number of people who felt left out, inadequately informed, inadequately educated, notified, et cetera, and were upset about the process and what little they had heard about some possible proposals. I have had serious reservations about doing this process until we have done a full central city area plan process for the 6.5 square miles that the staff has identified as the central city area until we have completed the Uniform Development Code -- UDC -- project to modernize and unify our zoning and subdivision regulations, until the Council has clearly established such parameters as who got to decide whether anything coming out of this -- these -- process could be moved forward to become City policy who had the power to amend any part of any plan or recommendation and how, et cetera, and until Council has developed, adopted an affordable housing policy after it has answered three questions: How fast do we want the population of the City to grow? Do we want everyone who moves in this area to be able to live within the City? Do we want to eliminate income housing segregation with all its itinerant problems within ten years? And my concern and goals with respect to the UDC, in part, are as follows: Ensuring that the UDC -- Uniform Development Code -- revisions do not open the door to rampant abuse by those who would seek to redevelop already zoned and built areas in the First Ward to the detriment of current residents and property owners, et cetera. I am generally supportive of the process and guidance from Clarion and Associates and Ferrell Madden for updating and combining our land-use regulation codes, zoning and subdivision rules, including MDT form-based proposal for downtown. I do not think we will be meaningfully ready to act on adoption of any new code for

18 to 24 months. The proposed changes are voluminous. Many of the changes are significant. The new format will be beneficial, but will take considerable time to get used to. It will take a long time to generate the participation from the broad range of stakeholders to review the changes applicable to their areas of interest. I have suggested to Tim Teddy, Director, Community Development Department, that the City work with a group of interested citizens to hold 30 to 40 interactive work sessions across the City to educate and engage a broad range of stakeholders for all the reasons above, as well as those advised by Christine Gardener in her comment, I urge the Planning and Zoning Commission to deny approval of this plan and request that staff not -- to not forward this plan to Council for its consideration until the problems that Christine and I and others have raised are resolved. I will urge my Councilperson, Clyde Ruffin, to vote to deny approval of this plan and to request that Community -- that Community Development Department suspend further neighborhood planning processes until my four untils listed above are complete. Respectfully submitted, John G. Clark, November 3, 2015. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REICHLIN: I'm going to assume now that the public hearing is over.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. REICHLIN: And open up this part of the meeting to the comments of commissioners regarding this matter. Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I want to start out by saying I -- I came into this hearing thinking that I would vote for approval of this plan and -- and I still feel that way. I do have some concerns that I just want to mention, and I think the -- that earlier, we talked about the difference between density concerns and design concerns. And my feel from this neighborhood is that we're not afraid of increased density because we're very neighborly. We like people, we like being able to get outside, walk around, talk to our neighbors, and density isn't an issue. But what is an issue is design and I don't know how we control that, and I don't think this plan can address that. And so I -- you know, it's -- I just see with the ADUs and the cottage clusters the ability of nonresident landlords to increase their units so a cluster becomes a four-unit rental property and that concerns me. But with that aside, I will support this plan.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else care to comment on this matter?

MR. HARDER: I'll comment. I -- I'm fairly new to the Planning and Zoning Commission, but it basically seems like there's been a lot of public feedback. Everybody that's come tonight seems to feel that the City staff has gotten pretty involved with the City and there's been quite a bit of time involved with that, as well, too. And because of the public's feedback on that, I'm definitely going to support it.

MR. REICHLIN: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: There's always going to be a struggle with participation from your neighbors because a lot of us don't have time to be involved in the intellectual pursuits of government. Got to work two, three jobs, got to work one here soon. So -- but we can only do as -- as best we can. Staff can only advertise so much. We can only have so many meetings. What we have to do as citizens is we have to -- we have to be the advertising. We have to be the marketing staff for our neighborhood and get as many people involved as possible. If it's not come to the meeting, it may be get their feedback and bring it to the

meeting if you can attend. We can only do so much as far as getting the input and I think the staff does a lot as far as trying to make different, unique alternatives to getting involved. We have to start somewhere. This is -- Steve, correct me if I'm wrong -- probably the first one to go through the whole cycle -- life cycle. Riight? So hopefully this one will go through. Unfortunately, West Central might be the guinea pig. All the other neighborhoods from here on out, you know, hopefully will learn from this process, and each neighborhood plan from here on out will get better and better. That's why I asked the question about it being a living document because each one of these plans that we do will get better, and West Central will come back and say, hey, okay. Well, we learned and we may want to adjust our plan. I think that's just going to happen and that's why I asked about how flexible it could be. I plan to support it just to the fact that we need to get through this process so that we can learn from it and improve, and we can only get better with time.

MR. REICHLIN: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I agree with Mr. Stanton. I appreciate all the time that the staff has put in on this. I appreciate the neighbors who have been meeting about this for almost a year. I plan to support it. I think this is a very comprehensive document. It's not set in stone. I don't think this is -- we're not -- while it's a learning experience for us, I feel like it can be a real opportunity for the neighborhood and for the City of Columbia.

MR. REICHLIN: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I don't think there is any question that West Central is the guinea pig for this experience. And I don't doubt either that new avenues or ideas will be discovered as we go through -- I forget how many neighborhoods now -- 26, something like that.

MR. MACINTYRE: Thereabouts.

MS LOE: So there is a lot of neighborhood plans to -- in the pipeline, and Steve is so excited about this. Trust me. And I am sorry not every experience with the process was a positive one, but it does sound like there were a lot of positive experiences that came out of this and that some neighbors did use it as an opportunity to get together and talk and form some discussion groups and coalesce. So I -- I mean, that is part of the process and not every step is going to be a step forward. There are going to be a couple of half-steps backwards. But as Mr. Stanton also pointed out, I don't believe this is a static document, either. I mean, it can't be. It's a living community, it's a growing community, and the document that represents it has to be able to represent that, as well. I think it raises issues and identifies priorities that are important to the community, and in that respect, it is a successful effort, so I do plan on supporting it.

MR. STRODTMAN: First off, I'd like to thank you guys. We feel your pain. We've been here for a quite a few hours. This is -- you know, we do this every other week, so I do thank you guys for coming here tonight. And what I would ask you is don't stop now. Even if you agree or don't agree with this, regardless, continue your participation. In my four years on this Board, that's always been the number one biggest gripe is that we're so reactive as a community and we're not engaging our -- our citizens in advance, and this was a major paradigm shift for the City to start this planning. And as Ms. Loe had

mentioned, you know, we've got 26 more of these to go through and, fortunately or unfortunately, we've got some really tough neighborhoods in those 26, not that you guys weren't or aren't tough, but there's going to be -- you know, it's going to be a long process, but we have to have this conversation because, as I think Mr. Zenner mentioned, the only thing that's constant is change. And the more that we can engage each other, the more that you guys will continue your involvement in your neighborhoods is -- is critical to us and our -- our community for success. Not everyone is going to agree, but we have to have at least some guiding tool to give us some direction and, more importantly, give you guys some direction as to what to expect. We've never done this before. Usually, we come into your neighborhoods when there is a zoning request or an applicant has proposed something, and that's the worst thing we can do is to come into your neighborhoods without, you know, giving you some heads up that there might be some change coming or, you know, there might be something to consider. And so I think it's really important that we're doing this and, you know, collaboration is -- is so critical for Columbia's success and for all of our success, and we all want to live here or we wouldn't be in this meeting tonight and we wouldn't live in this city. So in order for us to continue to want to live in Columbia, I think we need to engage all of community -- all of our, you know, citizens in our community to do this process. And I know City staff will probably have less hair or gray hair when it's all over, but at the end of the day, I think it's the betterment for our community to be proactive. And, you know, we -- we deal with so much controversy because we don't have these conversations in advance. And so, hopefully, if there are things that come up in advance, that we can come to you guys and it's not shell shock. It's -- we can do it proactively. We can do it with the best detail that we can. And at -- at the end of the day, we hope that the majority can agree that it was the best thing for the City and there's always going to be a small percentage that don't agree and that's just the way we live. So I plan on supporting it and, again, I just want to thank you guys for coming and I hope to see you -- many more of you at future meetings.

MR. REICHLIN: I would like to suggest that I've been through a few of these plans, but not at the City level. They've been Northeast Area Plan and East Area Plans. And the thing that it does -- that I've noticed that these kind of processes do enhance is communication, participation, and although it's kind of an offhand remark, it beats the alternative, because without something to rally around, right now, in the area and beforehand of this process, there are people who are eyeing various parcels of property with the intent to doing something with them, to develop them, and I'm from the development field myself, so I'm at cross purposes. But in terms of the fact that in order to have a unified and educated and participatory response, a plan like this is a lightning rod for that kind of activity. So it -- although it has -- it's created some bumps and bruises and maybe a few hurt feelings, whether it be via staff or members of the public, the ultimate result is for the common good. And the fact that everybody in this room now has a better sense of what the civic process is about is something that will go forward and build on itself not only within your area -- and I will admit that there may not be -- there still might be areas of this plan that need to be polished up. But now we have people creating neighborhood associations. We have people who want to down-zone their property from R-2 to R-1, and maybe six months ago, there wasn't very much activity going in that direction. So that's how this has been a lightning rod, and I think as we go through various

different parts of the City, I don't think that it has to be something that has to ultimately become a cross purpose with the development community, but it gives both the development community and the residents of -- who reside in any of these specific neighborhoods a tool, a meeting point, a concept, a guideline, however you want to couch it, for the betterment of the community as a whole. So with that in mind, I intend to support it. With that, may we have a roll call, please?

MS. LOE: I think we need a motion.

MR. REICHLIN: A motion. Good idea. Let's have a motion. Mr Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 15-38, the West Central Columbia Neighborhood Action Plan, I move to approve it.

MS. LOE: Recommend adoption.

MR. STANTON: Oh. Recommend adoption of said plan.

MR. REICHLIN: Would anybody care to second?

MR. STRODTMAN: Second.

MR. REICHLIN: Mr. Strodtman. May we have a roll call, please?

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing. Motion carries 7-0.

MS. LOE: Seven approvals. The motion carries. It'll be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you for coming out tonight.

VI) COMMENTS OF PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

VII) COMMENTS OF STAFF

MR. ZENNER: We would just like to --

MR. REICHLIN: Make note of the little red light.

MR. ZENNER: The light? I was going to understand the taking note of the button, but I was going to give you a game time update right now.

MR. REICHLIN: We're ready --

MR. ZENNER: Well, I thought you were. Unfortunately, for those that are here in the audience that would like to know, we are nearing the end of the third quarter, and Mississippi is up 24-13, and they are charging towards goal line.

MR. HARDER: It's 31-13 now.

MR. ZENNER: Thirty-one. Okay. Well, you've got a better app than I do. Nonetheless --

MR. REICHLIN: Is that going to temper your enthusiasm?

MR. ZENNER: Of course not. I just love being here this late at night with you all. Your next meeting is November 19th. We'll have a regular work session and we will have our regularly scheduled

meeting. This evening, we did have The Vineyards items tabled, so they will be coming onto this agenda. Again, given the nature of what we will have on the agenda, a quorum is needed and my understanding at this point, we do not have any excused absences for the November 19th meeting. However, if you will be gone, please let us know. We only have one more meeting through the end of this year, and that will be December 10, so, basically, after November 9 [sic], we have a downhill slide. Your items -- your items on the agenda, the two Vineyards plats that we deferred this evening. The Mataora Plat 3 Subdivision will be on the agenda, as well. That was an item that was supposed to be on tonight, however, due to a submission issue, was not brought forward. And then we will have tentatively, at this point, Creek Ridge Plat 2, which is a new preliminary plat south of the Creek Ridge Plat 1, which is just south of Forum Boulevard and Old Plank Road that we had recently took -- had taken through reapproval at Council for a reapproval of their final plat. We also tentatively have scheduled at this point Discovery Park Office Park, which is a C-P plan. This is north of Phillips Farm Road entering into the northern portion of Phillips Lake Park, or A. Perry Phillips Park. The maps, as we typically do for you, our Vineyards projects. The map on your right will change with the revised final plat. Some additional road rights-of-way will be added going back out towards Rolling Hills Road. The preliminary plat area will remain the same, however, as I had indicated at the beginning of our meeting this evening. And then the plats for the Mataora Subdivision, again, this is off of Rhea and Hector. The lots have been slightly reconfigured on this, I have been informed, but that is the general area. And the Creek Ridge plat, as I said, immediately to the south of the existing Creek Ridge Plat 1, which is the subdivision development that you see immediately to the north of that highlighted area. And, finally, the Discovery Office Park project, the C-P plan for the particular area out here at Discovery Park. One more item before I end this evening, and it was with great appreciation that I would like to not only recognize Mr. MacIntyre for his work on this plan, but I would also like to have Ms. Bacon come forward and be recognized, at least from the camera's perspective for us. This is Ms. Bacon's last evening this evening. She is -- she is taking a new position just outside of the Boulder area in Colorado. She has obviously, as has been stated this evening, been an instrumental staff member with us as it relates to this area plan, but she is also going to be sorely missed as it relates to our transportation planning responsibilities, historic preservation, and a variety of other efforts that she has participated in in the six years that she has been with us. Most notably the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Matrix, and a lot of the graphics that you all have had the opportunity to enjoy in our documents. We are advertising at this point to fill her position, and that is an unfortunate situation for me and for Tim as managers, but we hope to have a new member joining our staff probably January, February of '16. It is going to be a difficult position to fill, especially with the skill set that we are losing. But, again, I wanted to make sure that Rachel got some recognition, along with Steve. This is -- this is a wonderful evening for her to be here to be able to see such an accomplishment being arrived at. Also in the audience with us is our intern, Alex, who has also worked us. He is behind Mr. Smith in the audience, and Alex has been helpful in many ways as it relates to this project -- come on up, Alex -- basically, helping with a lot of what we would consider the grunt work. Some of the things that we have been able to accomplish through some of our efforts really aren't possible just because of the sheer few number of

people I have that work with me. And Alex has stepped in, helped Rachel, helped Steve, do public communication and flyers and things of that nature. As I think Hilary Clinton once said, it takes a village. It takes a village to run a planning department, and we have a very good village with a bunch of village people. But it is one of the wonderful opportunities to have such a great staff, and I don't often go off like this, but I'm very proud, and this is a wonderful evening for us to have made a year's worth of work basically complete and we will hopefully move forward and have another year like it. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman. You didn't blink me too many times, so we can go watch a football game.

MR. REICHLIN: I got caught up in the moment.

MR. ZENNER: I thought so.

VIII) COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

MR. REICHLIN: I'll entertain comments of Commissioners. I guess we're all talked out. Good.

IX) ADJOURN

MR. REICHLIN: A motion for adjournment?

MS. BURNS: I move to adjourn.

MR. STRODTMAN: I second.

MR. REICHLIN: Thumbs up. Good night.

(The meeting adjourned at 10:33 p.m.)