

**MINUTES**  
**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**MAY 5, 2016**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

**Mr. Steve Reichlin**  
**Ms. Sara Loe**  
**Mr. Rusty Strodman**  
**Ms. Tootie Burns**  
**Ms. Lee Russell**  
**Ms. Joy Rushing**  
**Mr. Dan Harder**  
**Mr. Brian Toohey**

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

**Mr. Anthony Stanton**

**I) CALL TO ORDER**

MR. REICHLIN: I will now call the May 5, 2016, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order. May we have a roll call, please, Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There are eight members present. We have a quorum.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you.

**II) APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MR. REICHLIN: At this time, I would like to touch on whether or not there are going to be any adjustments to the agenda. Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: There will be an adjustment to the agenda. Case No. 16-101 has requested to be tabled and we will need to move that item to the top of the agenda and we will address that at that point.

MR. REICHLIN: Okay. So then going forward, we'll move that up and address it at the start of the meeting.

**III) APPROVAL OF REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

MR. REICHLIN: But at this moment, we need to come to terms with approval of the minutes from the April 7 meeting. Are there -- is there anybody that has concerns regarding the minutes? Well, that said, I'll dive in. I must not have been having one of my better nights. To start out, on page 11, there's a reference to mud in one of the statements I made, which, for some reason, just doesn't make any sense, and I will find it here forthwith. Here, it's -- "That mud cleared it up a little bit." So somehow -- I don't recall what was said, but I think if we could come to terms with that one way or another, I think it would be appropriate. I don't know if we have to suggest that now, but I wanted to touch base on that one. And then on page 13, I may have committed the faux pas of referencing Ms. Russell as Lee. I don't recall that, but it came up in the minutes and I wondered whether or not we could revert back to Ms. Russell, just for the record. And then the last item is also on page 13, and there were a couple of references where the -- it's "let's flush it out a little bit," and that was a couple of times. My intent was, "Let's flesh it out a little bit." So with that, I move that we approve the minutes.

MS. RUSSELL: I'll second.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you. Take a thumbs up? I appreciate that. Okay.

**(Unanimous vote for approval.)**

#### **IV) SUBDIVISIONS**

##### **Case No. 16-101**

**A request by Engineering Surveys and Services (agent) on behalf of the City of Columbia (owner) for approval of a two-lot final minor plat on C-2 (Central Business District) zoned land, to be known as "Sixth and Cherry Garage Subdivision," along with an associated variance to Section 25-46(b). The 1.6-acre subject site is located on the northwest corner of Sixth Street and Locus Street.**

MR. REICHLIN: At this time, we've been made aware that a request to table has been presented to staff, so, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Just to let the public realize or know, the request has been made by the applicant to table this final plat with variance to the May 19th meeting, which is our next available Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. This is a site that is currently used half as a parking lot and then half as our Cherry Street parking deck. The platting action is basically to create a legal lot to assist in its future use, which is unknown. The parking area under a separate contractual association with the City, between the City and the University, has been executed and the plat is really just to clean up the nonlegal lot nature of the property. The applicant is requesting the application to be tabled. There has really been no information other than that they would just like to move it to the 19th's meeting. Staff is not objectionable to the tabling request and will bring forward the item to you again on the 19th's agenda.

MR. REICHLIN: With that, I'll turn the matter over to my fellow Commissioners for a motion to table.

MS. BURNS: I'll make a motion. I'd like to move that we table Case 16-101, the Sixth and Cherry Street Garage Subdivision until our May 19th meeting.

MR. REICHLIN: I'll second that. May we have a roll call.

MS. LOE: So voting in the case of 16-101.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns. Motion carries 8-0.**

MS. LOE: We have eight votes for, none against. The motion carries. Recommendation for tabling passes.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you, Ms. Loe.

#### **V) PUBLIC HEARINGS AND COMMENT**

MR. REICHLIN: Okay. So now we'll get into the public information and comment portion of the meeting.

##### **Case No. 16-110**

**A request by the City of Columbia to adopt a Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) governing subdivision and land use regulations throughout the City of Columbia's corporate**

**limits as requested by the City Council and supported by the City's 2013 comprehensive plan entitled "Columbia Imagined, The Plan for How We Live and Grow." The UDO will replace Chapter 25 (Subdivisions) and Chapter 29 (Zoning) of the City Code as well as incorporate provisions from Chapter 12A (Land Disturbance), Chapter 20 (Planning), Chapter 23 (Signs), and 24 (Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places) into its contents. This is the first of a series of information and comment meetings.**

MR. REICHLIN: With that, I'll pass this to staff for them to go forward with their presentation.

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner and Mr. Tim Teddy of the Planning and Development Department.

MR. REICHLIN: Mr. Strodman?

MR. STRODTMAN: I just had a small question. Was there any -- when we did the -- they did the test analysis, was there any consideration on cost? Did they give any kind of, you know, this is going to be a 2 percent increase or a --

MR. TEDDY: That wasn't within our scope. Now that -- I've had conversations with the Downtown Community Improvement District's consultant, as well as their director. They're going to have some -- some of that in their exercise, which I believe they'll want to present the results to you on. But, no, we didn't -- we didn't do that. It seemed to me it would be a little bit more technical than we had resources to pull off within the contract.

MR. STRODTMAN: But we will get a chance to see the CID's reports in session?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. We're working with them. We're trying to supply them with some information, and we had a -- had a conference call with them to just exchange some information, and I've also been exchanging some e-mails with that consultant, been talking to the executive director from time to time about it, as well. So they've made us aware that, yeah, they'd really like -- would like to get those results so that they can augment, I think, what we've been able to do. Our focus has been on drafting a code and then I would say, secondarily, doing these tests. So this will be with a little more emphasis on the -- (inaudible).

MR. REICHLIN: Is there anybody else? Seeing no one. So with engaging the public, it's not a public hearing, per se, is it?

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. It does not follow the same public hearing rules; however, if you do desire to follow the time limits in order to allow those that are here to have an adequate amount of time or the ability to speak. And if they want to speak twice, I don't see that as a problem.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you. Well, with that -- with this brief overview of the code tests, if there's anybody in the audience who cares to share anything regarding these matters, feel free to approach the podium at this time. Seeing no one. Oh, wait. Sorry.

MR. MURPHY: Kevin Murphy with A Civil Group, and I just had some questions of staff, if that's okay. This is basically a zoning change. I know you're incorporating several of these other sections of the ordinance in there, 12A, 23, 24, 25. Are they just being basically integrated or are there

changes to those sections, as well?

MR. TEDDY: There are some changes. Primarily, integrated, especially in the case of something like the sign ordinance, Chapter 23. That was moved over with very minimal changes. Twelve-A, that was moved over and there are some fairly significant changes to the tree preservation, for example, so definitely yes on that. The way you would determine if something has been changed or not is it's going to be a footnoted -- or it is a footnoted document. If you don't see a footnote after the text, that is existing texts. It's what we have in our code today, although possibly in another chapter of the code, but if it's been changed, that'll be footnoted, and the general nature of the note will be explained. And there's a few other notes that just explain whether -- you know, whether something was considered. It might not signify a change, but it might explain that there was an issue associated with that language, but, primarily, that's how the changes are identified in the document.

MR. MURPHY: Does the document online, it kind of compares?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. I mean, we don't have a markup version where you're going to see the text of the current version crossed out or -- or otherwise modified, but you are going to see those notes that indicate that a passage has been changed.

MR. MURPHY: Those tree preservation requirements, was that per that report that was done by the arborist a year ago or --

MR. TEDDY: There -- well, there -- there were some recommendations early on of the City Arborist, and then lately there have been recommendations from a task force that the Council had appointed, and that's one of the -- one of the things they took on was reviewing our -- our tree preservation.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. I thought I had heard a mention of a requirement for platting for building permits. Currently, there's a set of rules for -- to make unplatted lots or allow unplatted lots to be legal lots. Is that -- is that being done away with?

MR. TEDDY: There's some modifications to that where, in general, we're looking -- we're recommending that, in general, that building sites be platted lots. And I think you're referring to recorded surveys where it might be a meets and bounds survey, but because of its age, it's grandfathered.

MR. MURPHY: Surveys or inscriptions or whatnot; correct.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And we're looking -- in this code, we're recommending that we move things more into the modern order of subdivision.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. The by right zonings, what -- are there any guarantees that just general opposition to that is not going to push it into a planned district? I know you're trying to get away from the - many of these planned districts, but what's --

MR. TEDDY: You mean, will the approach hold? That's -- I mean, that's to be seen, I think, yeah. I --

MR. MURPHY: All right. Are planned districts basically dealt with in the same manner that they are now?

MR. TEDDY: They require a plan. And the idea here -- this is a major shift because, as you know, you can now propose a planned district with just a text document and a plan to materialize later that's consistent with that text document. This would require an actual physical plan because the idea is that a developer already knows what he or she wants to do. They can't find a district that will accommodate it, however, they believe it's superior than anything the base district would require, so they offer it to the Planning and Zoning Commission. We're trying to get away from what I would call the in-between type planned districts where it -- the development program is too intense for one district, but there's a desire to make it not quite as intense as the next district higher and, therefore, a PD is the solution, so you, in effect, write in a unique district. We're trying to get away from that, quite honestly, because if -- if land is properly platted in a subdivision, if infrastructure is available, there really isn't a great need to do that. But if there's some irregularity to the site or some unusual layout of the buildings that is somehow not allowed by the -- by the ordinance, PD is a good solution in those cases, because a lot of times you get better results.

MR. MURPHY: Still be able to kind of offer something up and --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And they can be conditioned, that sort of thing. There -- there could be self-imposed conditions as part of that, yeah. And I'm not talking about anything approaching construction plans, just something that would indicate the layout of the development on a preliminary basis.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. I wrote a note here, and I can't recall exactly what it was, but 29-4 had changes to design standards. What section was 29-4?

MR. ZENNER: 29-4 is the form and development controls within the -- within the code. As Tim pointed out, we do have -- there will be neighborhood protection standards which deal with building height reduction, setback increases, deals with landscaping and screening standards in order to allow for adequate transition. It also proposed multifamily building standards that currently do not exist to basically deal with maximum number of attached dwelling units being able to be combined, articulation standards, roof pitch, and the like to ensure that we have more compatible -- generally, more compatible buildings within the more intense residential zoning districts -- really generally intended to address neighborhood issues in the R-3 zone or what will become the RMF.

MR. MURPHY: I just had two more questions real quickly, if that's all right. There's been some talk of sufficiency of resource tests. Is that being included in this?

MR. ZENNER: That's an interesting question because that was brought up this past week and I'll let Tim respond to that, as well.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. We had a public info -- town hall on Saturday, and that was one of our five topics. There's several places in the code where sufficiency of resources language has been added. Any rezoning that obligates us as a City staff to prepare an analysis of whether or not the variety of uses that that rezoning would regenerate can be accommodated with existing infrastructure and services, so that's been added. The similar language for a conditional use, and that's something that the Planning and Zoning Commission will examine. And then for subdivisions and plans, there's also language that

indicate that developers will have to provide statements on whether infrastructure is sufficient and that's something that again the Commission will look at if it's a subdivision, Council will also look at. And it's really -- it's fairly general language. It's not any kind of specific technical analysis that's demanded at this point. It's just indicating that there's an expectation that those issues are going to be addressed in the review process.

MR. ZENNER: There is also sufficiency of resources or our -- its goal and objective out of Columbia Imagined, as you're probably well aware, it is also a project that we are currently, as a staff, working with the Commission on. There is a separate free-standing task force, the infrastructure task force, that is a Council body that is due to produce reports on infrastructure policies and possibly cost allocation modeling in August of this year, if I recall correctly. So, I mean, there's a couple of moving pieces to that entire topic. I think what we have worked on up to this point with the Commission is not necessarily a quantifiably driven process, it's more advisory as it relates to site-specific development proposals acting as potentially the basis for development agreement type of negotiations where sites may be identified as being deficient in one particular aspect or another. As Tim has pointed out, a lot of what the code includes is basically a lot of what we already do, but what is more or less not necessarily observable by the public because it's a back -- it's a back action.

MR. MURPHY: What would be an example of what the developer would have to provide as proof of sufficiency of resources?

MR. TEDDY: Well, if you're doing an annexation and zoning, for example, is there a sewer at the tract. I mean, there no doubt have been examples in the past of tracts that have been upzoned, but with no infrastructure available to it at the time of rezoning. I think this ordinance creates an expectation that if it isn't there, there will be something, maybe a subdivision proposal, indicating that there's a guarantee that the upzoned property is going to have sewer available. It's not a matter of, well, we've zoned it up, so we've -- we've granted some entitlement to build at a -- at a higher intensity, but not knowing the specific plan for bringing sewer to the site. So that would be just a simple example of --

MR. MURPHY: So you're just having a plan to provide if there -- if there is a known deficiency?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And whether the -- the -- you know, not only available, but is it of sufficient size and capacity to handle the loads that we would anticipate. If you have a plan, that's, you know, kind of in your court because you can show what facilities are necessary to execute that plan, where if it's a rezoning, that's something that really it's more the -- the City staff's expertise because we're going to look at all the different possible plans or at least most of the possible plans.

MR. MURPHY: Best intended use for that --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. Yeah. And provide comments on whether we think the infrastructure can handle it.

MR. MURPHY: Finally, in the MDT that -- you were talking about a requirement 15 percent open space in -- in -- I'm assuming the residential type structures. Would that -- is that based on the footprint of the building or the total square footage?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. That's based on the footprint. You're talking about the MDT standard?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And it -- and I might have misspoke. I emphasized the residential, but that would be any building that would be a requirement, and it's based on the lot area. So the -- yeah. Oh, I'm sorry. It is the footprint, yeah, which oftentimes is going to be the lot area, but perhaps not every time.

MR. MURPHY: It could be a ten-story building, but it's still based on -- on the --

MR. TEDDY: Right. Right. And so it can be distributed on multiple levels. The example of balconies, if the balconies meet the minimum size standard, up to a third of that 15 percent could be the balconies. If there's an active rooftop, that could be counted. If there's some kind of little plaza area or atrium area, some kind of amenity. We asked the consultant what -- what was the reasoning behind the 15 percent, and they just said it's just something that would push you more towards higher quality development, you know, the ideas that you don't have buildings that are packed dense with leasable units, such as apartments.

MR. MURPHY: Very good. Thank you. And thank you, Commissioners.

MR. REICHLIN: Yes. Mr. Murphy -- if you -- Mr. Murphy --

MR. STRODTMAN: I just want to follow with question that Mr. Murphy asked the staff. So the sufficiency resource test, would that be for all projects or certain projects?

MR. TEDDY: All rezonings and conditional uses. There's nothing in there that ties a building permit to sufficiency resources. So to the extent that we do zoning review when someone applies for a building permit, if the zoning allows the use, there's not a provision in this ordinance that says we run a sufficiency resource test. We do it anyway, though. We do have all the utility departments and then the outside the city, if there are utility or other service providers, we have them comment on building plans, so we'll --

MR. STRODTMAN: Would the -- would the scorecard that we looked at in the past, would that be incorporated or this would replace that or --

MR. TEDDY: No. I think that'll have a role because it is somewhat subjective at a certain level particularly when you're talking about rezoning because again you don't have plans and our infrastructure service providers will tell you that they really can't say definitely yes or no unless they have specific plans.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right.

MR. TEDDY: They've got to know the number of fixtures, et cetera, the usage, and that kind of thing, and they have to make assumptions on -- on daily usage. So, yeah, there -- there -- it's going to be part art and part science, and a rating system can help you establish what's a well-furnished development site versus less well provide -- or well serviced development site, I think. Do you have anything to --

MR. REICHLIN: Anything else? Anybody else? Thank you, Mr. Murphy. Anybody else in the audience? Thank you.

MS. ESSING: Hello, everyone. I'm Katie Essing, the executive director for the downtown CID. And I just wanted to answer in a little more detail on your question on the independent testing that we're

working on, and it is with a vendor consultant called Winter & Company. They're the same consultant that created the design guidelines that we shared probably a year ago with you. And the hope is that it will go a little bit deeper on the test and look at the financial implication and also look further beyond just student housing, but other types of development. So we should have the results back around June 1st, and we will openly share those with you and the public. So it should be well before the June 23rd hearing. So thank you for your help in looking at this.

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions? Seeing none, thank you. Anybody else wishing to comment?

MR. CULLAMORE: Hi, I'm Dan Cullamore, 715 Lyon Street. I'm the president of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association. I arrived a little bit late. Mr. Teddy, you were talking about the development that's -- or a test of the area where Ms. Ravapudi is developing those apartments. Did you describe the difference between what was allowed by the new code and what is currently going in?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. I -- I didn't, and that's because we -- we could have used that as an example of -- of the test and we can still go through that exercise. But we looked at a portion of that site as a vacant site, and we looked at the houses that used to be on either side, and that was the -- the object of the test was to see what that would yield out. But as long as you're asking the question, one of the differences is that's a very long row of buildings and I think it probably goes beyond the 200-foot limit, so there would have to be some spacing in there that would allow folks to walk from the back of the property to the front of the property. Right now, it's very attractive or at least it looks like it's going to be attractive with a lot of articulation in it. But the fact is, that whole frontage has got buildings across it, so I think the code is looking to break those up into separate building units, so that would be one difference there that I could point out. It doesn't require as much -- the development code doesn't require as much parking. And that project, I looked at the plans for it. The actual project, I think, is providing even more than our current code provides, so maybe that's some food for thought. I mean, they're going over what our current parking ratio provides. It's all in the back of the building to -- accessed off the alley. They could do significantly less parking on that site under this proposal as it's written currently.

MR. CULLAMORE: Do you know what the difference in the number of units is?

MR. TEDDY: There's 20 in the actual project, but it's a little bit larger site because it incorporates -- I think there's three single-family lots that were incorporated into it. The test site is 40,000 square feet, so a little bit smaller, and that 16 units will be built there, and it could be really any bedroom configuration. And we didn't -- they didn't build us any kind of three-dimensional model that shows what that would look like, but the -- they worked with general envelopes and things in -- in making that conclusion.

MR. CULLAMORE: And -- and the design standards, is -- is there a provision made for design in the round because I know that's well articulated -- that particular development is well articulated --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MR. CULLAMORE: -- on the north side facing Rogers --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MR. CULLAMORE: -- but it's an absolute blank wall on the backside. There's no articulation whatsoever.

MR. TEDDY: You're talking about the south side elevation?

MR. CULLAMORE: The south side of -- of the Ravapudi development, yeah.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. Well, there's a requirement for four-sided design for multifamily structures, so there would be an expectation that at least the same materials would come around to the back. Now, that's if visible from a public street, so there would be some question in my mind, there is an alley there. So if it's a public alley, you could argue that, yeah, that's a publicly viewable --

MR. CULLAMORE: It's visible from my bedroom.

MR. TEDDY: Oh, okay. Well, that's very important, isn't it? Yeah. In a four-sided design, though, the idea is the same quality finishes on the front carry around to the back and that's in there. I believe there is some articulation requirement for that. On the front side, I think it's every 30 feet, there has to be some variation.

MR. CULLAMORE: All right. Thank you. It might be a useful exercise to do that comparison on a lot that's -- a test site that's being already developed. So thank you.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else caring to comment this evening?

MR. FARNEN: Good evening. My name is Mark Farnen, 103 East Brandon. I've made several notes. On the first -- the first one I want to talk about is on the -- the neighborhood protection district where a single-family dwelling is next to a proposed R-3 or what is R-3 called now, multi --

MR. TEDDY: RMF

MR. ZENNER: RMF

MR. FARNEN: -- RMF. And that you could either move it back or build it smaller, and you could satisfy the requirements there. My understanding is is that in that instance, it's not what the zoning of the single-family lot is, it's the use. So in other words, I could have an R-3 lot next to an R-3 lot, but if I have a single-family house on that R-3 lot, that prevents the other R-3 lot from building out. Right?

MR. TEDDY: I think if is designed in an R-3 context, and we'll call RMF, to represent the new name. In an RMF context, if a lot is only of sufficient size that it would allow a single-family, then you treat it as if the single-family is there and it has to be buffered. If it's a larger lot, though, and it's vacant, could become a multifamily structure, then there would not be the same level of transition required. That's the way I understand the code. It's really designed to protect the transition from a large building to a small building.

MR. FARNEN: Right. And so --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And you can do that by either lot size or the actual presence of the small single-family building.

MR. FARNEN: Not by the zoning?

MR. TEDDY: No. Because within RMF, you are going to get these smaller lots that we -- we

have them throughout those areas north of Broadway and then east of College where there's traditional single-family platting that's become multifamily, so you still have a lot of -- or you still have a lot of single-family --

MR. FARNEN: So if homes -- so if I have -- if I have two lots that are next to each other, and one has whatever zoning on it and it's vacant, then nothing kicks in on the other lot?

MR. TEDDY: Well, the -- the individual that's building would be obligated to provide the screening and the transition which could be a step down in height if that lot -- that vacant lot is only of sufficient size to allow single-family because then we know that that's what will be --

MR. FARNEN: That's why I'm asking the question. I thought that the way the rule was stated is what is its use. And if its use is vacant, then it wouldn't -- then it wouldn't invoke the -- the rule about the step down or the setback. And this is not a gotcha, this --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. I know. I understand. Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: And Mark -- and I think you're referring to the applicability section of --

MR. TEDDY: Here's what he is asking about -- buildings constructed after the effective date.

MR. ZENNER: So he's talking about the applicability. He's talking about -- you're talking about the standards applied to and it's item number one?

MR. FARNEN: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. It's in all -- to all lots in the RMF that contain a use other than single-family and two-family, which in your opening comments, multifamily building adjacent to a vacant lot that you want to develop as a multifamily building. Correct?

MR. FARNEN: It's -- I have -- here's my lot right here, and the computer is this lot. This one is vacant. I want to build a multifamily right here. That's vacant. I don't care what it's zoned. Right? I don't care what it's used as because the use is vacant, so I can build it here?

MR. ZENNER: The code is silent on vacancy, however, I would probably agree with where Mr. Teddy is in an interpretation scenario. If the lot that is vacant only can accommodate because of the RMF size -- minimum lot size, a single-family or a two-family structure on it, we would require that that multifamily building be done to protect to the future single-family that would be on that lot.

MR. FARNEN: But you're not protecting it from anything. There's nothing there.

MR. ZENNER: Nothing there may not always be there, though.

MR. FARNEN: Okay.

MR. TEDDY: The example I'm recalling is actually MDT where it's bordering a multifamily district. If that lot is vacant, but it's only of sufficient size, I'm quite sure that language -- that's a different section -- that language says that buffering has to be put in place. There's a -- it's a different transition rule than the one I've been quoting for RMF, but there is --

MR. FARNEN: Yeah, I know. I was confused about that too.

MR. TEDDY: There is a transition required, so --

MR. FARNEN: Okay.

MR. TEDDY: We'll sort it out. We'll come back and we'll present our table of transition.

MR. FARNEN: Okay. Here's another little piece of that. Does it matter if the person that owns the lot next to it objects or doesn't object? Let's say that -- that I live here or I -- I want to build here, and this isn't vacant, this is where my father lives. And he goes, well, go right ahead; is that okay?

MR. TEDDY: That's the way towns may have traditionally been laid out, but that -- not in the zoning era. I mean, is that person going to live there forever?

MR. FARNEN: But -- no. I know they won't, but -- but it's when it's built.

MR. TEDDY: Or live forever.

MR. FARNEN: Yeah. I mean, we'll change a lot of things as we go forward. I just -- I'm asking if -- if it is agreed to by this party, is it permissible for this?

MR. TEDDY: I don't think there's anything in the code that recognizes private agreements like that.

MR. FARNEN: Okay.

MR. TEDDY: Not that I'm aware of.

MR. FARNEN: All right. On the -- on the Tenth and Broadway project that was cited, and most people thought that's a pretty good one, there were a few things that didn't make the test, and one of them was the length of the span where there's no door on the Tenth Street side, I think. Can you put a fake door in there and are you cool?

MR. TEDDY: No. It'll -- it'll say -- I think it says it has to be a functional door. What they could do is ask an exception, and I would think it's a good case if you basically say it's a large space that's going to get designed later, do you choose where to put the doors on a large commercial street-level space?

MR. FARNEN: Uh-huh.

MR. TEDDY: Well, not always. I would say generally, yes, but not always, so there could be some allowance for that. You're working with, you know, a pizza restaurant and you want to see where -- how their architect lays out the space. Well, I want the door over here, I didn't want it on this side, you know.

MR. FARNEN: Right.

MR. TEDDY: So I think accommodations like that can be made, but the general rule is, let's have active street frontage. I mean, this is all about looking at what's made the downtown special and that's that there's a lot of activity on the sidewalks because there's a lot of comings and goings, and it's really just a way of kind of enforcing that character. It's one every -- one door probably every 75 feet, I think, at minimum.

MR. FARNEN: Right.

MR. TEDDY: And you're going to have storefronts that are really narrow, so there's going to be a -- a much larger interval. There is averaging allowed, so an architect could look at the entire block on things like even the -- even the site composition.

MR. FARNEN: The other spacing on other --

MR. TEDDY: The combination of all the windows and such. They can bring other buildings into their analysis and show that on average every -- if it's 60 feet like it would be on Broadway and Ninth, or 75 feet where it will be a little distant from those two streets, they -- they could average the entire block and they might have a set of narrow storefronts that are very -- you know, they've produced the variety that's desired in that code, and they could have a longer stretch, but the average works out to less. That's something that the consultant included in their write up for the test is that that could be done, and they didn't have those data, so they didn't know that there's another building to the north of the example, so --

MR. FARNEN: Okay.

MR. TEDDY: And, honestly, they kind of surprised me because they thought they were looking at each building as something that had to meet a set of standards, but that's -- that's something that the code will allow.

MR. FARNEN: But no fake door?

MR. TEDDY: I -- I think it usually says that it has to be a functional door, so I don't conclude -- I think you mean something that's just decoration. Right? It doesn't --

MR. FARNEN: Yeah.

MR. TEDDY: It's not even a service door?

MR. FARNEN: Oh, no. I mean, put it like it looks like a real door, and then just say you don't want a door here, you know.

MR. TEDDY: You would --.

MR. FARNEN: And put that sign on it or whatever you have to do, but I --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MR. FARNEN: I mean, just put a fake one. That's what we're talking about as form, not use. Right?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. So, something that's just a door that's not used; is that what you're talking about?

MR. FARNEN: Yeah.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MR. FARNEN: You couldn't?

MR. TEDDY: I don't -- I don't have language in there now that says that, that's all I'm telling you.

MR. FARNEN: Well, the reason I bring that up is, it goes to the same thing about fake second stories. And I don't know -- I still don't understand the rule on what -- what is real and what is not and what is based on design or the look or the feel of it and the use. That's where I'm going.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. No. I understand you're coming from -- yeah.

MR. FARNEN: Okay. Then this is about process. And, Pat, you did a great job at lining out what we're going to talk about at each of the meetings. What I can't figure out still is how do you know when you've won one? We have so many different issues that are -- that are out here, and -- and then we're going to have one vote in August. And is that the first time we know if we got this piece included or this

piece included, or are you all going to vote little votes in between and say I like that idea, let's put that in our recommendation going forward, so we -- we get to August. We've already dealt with some of the side issues and we know what the will of this group is, basically, and then -- or is there no little votes in between?

MR. ZENNER: The intention is to bring a final document to the Commission for consideration. So, we're -- we're not -- not unlike what we did when we did the module process, we're not going to be making incremental changes to the document that is out for public consumption from now until the end of August.

MR. FARNEN: Well, how do we know before then what makes it in?

MR. TEDDY: I think that would be in the version that gets a vote, there would have to be explanation that we received a comment. We could refer to the date of the comment, too, and say just say it either is in or it's not in, and then why -- why or why not. That's probably -- other than, say, you've got to -- you've got to read the section you're concerned about and make sure that it's either incorporated or not, that's about all I can suggest. But I think at this point, yeah, that's what we'll -- we'll need to do. We'll have to recognize what the issues are with this and then in our ultimate public hearing, report on that to the Commission to provide some kinds of explanation.

MR. FARNEN: But that meeting will have to be ten hours long -- that last meeting because --

MR. TEDDY: Well --

MR. FARNEN: -- they're going to have to say, even if we looked at the Clarion memo, the one that is the separate one that's going to be integrated for the next meeting and all that, and we have the either/ors. We had -- you're at the fork in the road; do you go here or here. We don't know. If this group is going to make a recommendation to the Council about what it would prefer to see, how do we know what they're going to pick unless they articulate every one of those on the August meeting night? Then that will take ten hours.

MR. TEDDY: Well, and I think what you can't put into a schedule, at least at this stage, is kinds of discussions we're going to need to have on issues because we don't know until they emerge what they may be. We're overprogramming if we build in meetings to reconcile things, but we know we're going to have to do a certain amount of reconciliation because people are going to say, well, look, I like this ordinance, but I cannot abide X, Y, and Z.

MR. FARNEN: Right.

MR. TEDDY: So you make a special effort to work at those, but we can't schedule those sessions till we know what those things are.

MR. FARNEN: But would -- would this group be allowed to do that? In other words, is it within the purview of the Planning and Zoning Commission to, at some point during this meeting, say, you know what, we just heard a very interesting question from Dan Cullamore. Let's talk about that. And Dan said what about this four-sided design and all that? What's -- what do we think about this as a Commission? Let's be sure and put that in our recommendation. Can they do that?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And they come back with revised language. If -- if it's something that's lacking now, you come back with something written, according to that request.

MR. FARNEN: All right. Okay. That's what I got tonight. Thank you, guys. Thank you. Sorry.

MR. REICHLIN: Not a problem. Thank you, sir.

MR. WATERS: Hi. I'm Andy Waters, 300 Lindell Drive. I'm also a CID board member, and I have a question for staff. I think you just answered it. The question has to do with the Clarion memo and also the -- the regulating plan map. There were some errors in it that I think -- you know, last time I checked were still there.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MR. WATERS: Did you just say that you're going to incorporate those into another draft before the Commission --

MR. TEDDY: That's correct. Yeah. Yeah. Mr. Zenner commented about there being a draft available for the 19th, and we're making corrections to the regulating plan map. I've got a marked-up version that's not going to look very good online, but we've got it all hand marked and we're going to put more civic structures in, for example. And by civic structures, Commissioners, there's a rule that says if it's a government, institutional, religious building, it can be exempt from those MDT standards. And the idea is that there's other traditions of design and they're typically irregularly masked buildings anyway, so they don't lend themselves to -- so I think that would be one example of something we're putting in there.

MR. WATERS: Okay. And the aspects of the Clarion memo that address the regulating plan map will be in there?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MR. WATERS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. OTT: Hi. My name is John Ott, and I live at 212 Bingham Road. I'm on the -- I'm a CID board member and a downtown property owner. I just have a couple questions. One is as somebody who has been working on, you know, primarily historic buildings or redeveloping maybe warehouse buildings or metal buildings, you know, it -- you know, it appears that a lot of this is -- is focused on newer construction. Do you see the kind of work that I am engaged in, is this -- is this draft -- are these draft regulations going to help facilitate what I do or will they possibly create, you know, obstacles, or where -- how do you see that?

MR. TEDDY: Well -- and I'm familiar with a lot of your work and it's -- it's good work. I think there probably will be some particular types of buildings that will be a challenge just because I look at this as really focusing on probably the most developed downtown streets, you know, the ones that have buildings that were built in the nineteenth century and they're storefront-type buildings with loft spaces above. I see it working well with that. You're talking about things that might -- might have been industrial buildings, but you're remodeling them, repurposing them. The Orr Street Studios would be another example. I mean, there's a building there that, you know, at one time, it was a warehouse. Now it's artists' studios. And, you know, all I can say is we probably want to look at whether all these sod composition standards and

things that emphasize the presence on the street work for those buildings. I mean, you -- you can provide valuable testimony on that if you know what the standard is and you know how you want to work with buildings. You can perhaps furnish some examples that the Commission can look at and decide for themselves if that code is going to apply well to it. I think it gets a little tougher to apply this MDT as you get onto the edge of downtown because you're no longer in what was built as a downtown. At one time, it was the whole town, so it's got, you know, that mix of eclectic buildings, so --

MR. OTT: When you mention the MDT, is that -- is the -- is the -- are the lines of the MDT currently the -- the CID boundary lines; is that what that is?

MR. TEDDY: It's not -- the initial instructions to Clarion and Farrell Madden was we need a different C-2 district. That's what people were clamoring for. So they originally worked just in that footprint, just wherever C-2 zoning was present. We added some of the M-1, which is general industrial district, on the basis that we've had two planning reports. We've had the Suzuki study for downtown, and then more recently, the H3 Design Studio report, the Charrette, recommend that we do something different other than industrial zoning there, that we allow residential, for example, we allow mixed use. Don't necessarily require on-site parking, and that's what the manufacturing districts allow. So it -- it is in and outside of the CID boundary, but, in general, it's the C-2 plus those pockets of M-1 that are adjacent to the downtown.

MR. OTT: So I'm a little -- you know, on the -- on the diagram that has the orange and the light blue, and we've discussed this a little bit before, but I wanted to do it, you know, publicly, just so -- the -- the light -- the light blue, if I understand it right, suggests that you can have office along the -- the -- along the street, but then on the corners, you can have commercial. And, you know, to me, it seems if I -- if I have -- if I understand that correct. But where those lines currently are, you know, I think it's kind of a blurry thing because, you know, we already have commercial uses up and down Park from all -- you know, from basically Tenth Street all the way up to College, you know on the one side. And then on St. -- St. James, we have, you know, commercial uses and so on. So, you know, I was just -- I don't know how -- you know, what the process is or what the opportunity is to, you know, relabel what the MDT would be because it seems like that Park going up to basically where the Flat Branch -- the Brew Pub is and the Atkins building, all of that, is more commercial, even though it wasn't the traditional downtown, that's probably, you know, as our town is growing, our -- our -- you know, the future for downtown to grow. And, you know, one point that I'd make is that, you know, right now, we get reports that downtown is 98 percent leased out. And so, as people come to Columbia and they're looking for places to be in the City's center, there may not be opportunity. So they're forced to go out to a strip mall or something like that or -- and so, I don't -- you know, I hope we don't get in a position where we -- we limit our downtown area to where the -- where the boundaries currently are, and at least show a -- show an avenue where that industrial property connects, you know, near Park and Tenth so that we continue to make improvements for downtown.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And I -- Mr. Ott, I appreciate you bringing it to the Commission's attention.

Commissioners, Pat is showing the regulating plan on the screen, and the blue color is what's called apartment or town home/small apartment -- or townhouse/small apartment -- I'll get it if I keep saying it -- townhouse/small apartment building form standard. And the way that is currently written, the uses allowed are commercial only at corners, meaning retail commercial at corners, and then within the block, residential and office is permitted. And then there's a four-story height limit, so there's some different maximum building intensity there than in the majority of downtown. The idea was to create a transition because you have neighborhoods then that interconnect with the existing C-2 there, but it raises a good point. You do have some of those streets that are coded in the blue that might be commercial blocks currently or nonresidential blocks, at least. So that's probably something we need to think about between now and our MDT session that we're going to have in June, I would say. But the general desire is to have a stepping down of intensity so you don't have ten-story buildings allowed right at the edge of the downtown district. I can say that much. There probably should be accommodation, though, for any street that's an existing nonresidential or almost completely nonresidential street that we're not trying to convert it into mixed use.

MR. OTT: Yeah. And I appreciate that, but that -- a lot of that corridor, you know, is -- is M-1 or you know.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MR. OTT: And I would think if I lived in the neighborhood -- a nearby neighborhood, the idea of limiting retail and commercial things would -- would not be a positive thing. I think it would attract me more to live in that neighborhood if I could walk down and go to a restaurant or, you know, do some of the things that exist, you know, in other parts -- you know, in the more traditional part of downtown as you mentioned, but --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. We could almost go street by street, and we might find that the concept works on a few of those sort of half-blocks that are on there, but then there are some others that it might not work as well.

MR. OTT: I have one other question and that relates to solid waste. You know, I know you guys talked -- I don't know if there's any -- any part within this draft regulation that relates to that. I know we talked about balconies and green space and -- and those are all very important things. But I also -- you know, I'm seeing some developments occurring downtown where there -- there hasn't been any provisions for that. And the solution is we're just going to put dumpsters in the alley. And there's one in the alley next to Missouri Theater, you know. Previously, all of their provisions for trash were on their property. There was one very active business, Shakespeare's. And my understanding is that the way it's going to work right now is not -- all of the apartments plus Shakespeare's -- an expanded Shakespeare's, plus whatever new commercial things, it's all going to be in the alley.

MR. TEDDY: Uh-huh.

MR. OTT: And -- and I don't know -- you know, I'm sure there's other areas within the code and stuff where that can be addressed, but I don't -- I do think that that is -- as we are -- downtown is growing

and we're creating draft regulations for it, that there ought to be some -- possibly in this document some consideration for that.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. And this is something we've had comment on before, particularly with the larger buildings downtown. We haven't written anything in it yet. We're working on a solution. Usually, what you find on solid waste in the codes is not a specification that says, you know, in a cookie-cutter fashion, well, if you do a mixed-use midrise, you have to have a trash room of such and such a size, but you have language that the problem has to be managed and sufficient information has to be furnished to convince the building official that you've got a place for your trash and recyclables. That's probably the state of the art that I've seen. You probably -- you probably have a variety of dimensions and things for the spaces that developers put in. That's probably why it's not a -- a uniform standard like you have in commercial strip development. You'll have dumpster-pad specifications and enclosure requirements and things like that. There's not really an equivalent for that for downtown, but that's something we've heard and I think we'll try to work --

MR. OTT: Perhaps, at a minimum, just have it within their own -- within the footprint of their own property, you know, possibly.

MR. TEDDY: We've also gotten comments that there should -- for the really large buildings, there ought to be loading areas dedicated, even if it's only for a move-in day, because being a college town, that -- that's usually the same day for everybody, so --

MR. OTT: Yeah.

MR. TEDDY: -- you know, that -- that comment has been made, too.

MR. OTT: Thank you very much.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you, sir. Do we have anybody else wishing to comment?

MR. LAND: Paul Land, 4104 Jocelyn Court. I give my business address so often, I can't remember my residence. John brought up some points on the regulating plan, and I own a property at 1102 East Broadway, which is Alpine Shop, at the corner of Hitt and Broadway. And on that regulating plan, at Hitt Street between Broadway and Cherry Street, is shown as a blue street, and it's all commercial properties along that. So, I wanted to make sure when that regulating plan is adjusted, that that street becomes an orange street to reflect the existing conditions. I have another question, though. Dealing with these planned districts, the -- the feeling of taking over this new change in -- in this UDO and replacing our past zoning is to get away from some of the planned districts. And in my capacity as a broker, it becomes a little bit cumbersome when we deal with second- and third-generation uses within a planned district when a center or an office building has been put through a planned district, and then two or three generations of tenants have come and gone. It gets hard to go back and figure out what those regulations were. It's very cumbersome. Do you think there will be a provision at some point to convert some of these planned districts to some of these new -- new districts? How will that be perceived by the Planning and Zoning Commission? How would it be perceived by the Council?

MR. TEDDY: Well, if I may, I'll just explain that Clarion is recommending that, first of all, we don't

roll back any existing planned districts. So all the existing planned districts are going to be annotated on the map as having their own ordinance, no changes to it. That doesn't mean there can't be conversations with individual property owners about some better zoning alternative. It's just to say -- it's not the intention here to just go ahead and assume we're going to replace all those with either a base district or a rewritten.

MR. LAND: But a property owner could make that application?

MR. TEDDY: A property owner could make that request. That would be appropriate.

MR. LAND: And if it was an undeveloped property, maybe it would be better received?

MR. TEDDY: It would be probably a good candidate for a new improved base district if that fit their -- their plans and was compatible with the surrounding area.

MR. LAND: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: You're welcome. Thank you for your comments. Is there anybody else? We've got everybody -- got that opportunity? Yes, Mr. Harder [sic]?

MR. TOOHEY: I've got a question. Going back to Mr. Farnen's question. If you had two properties in RMF that were both vacant and they were both equal size, and one of the owners was going to build to the maximum height, could the neighbor decide to downzone that property to R-1 and then would they limit what the first owner can do -- on how high they can -- they could build that potential building?

MR. TEDDY: If it's -- if the downzoning is done before the building is built.

MR. TOOHEY: So, if someone --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MR. TOOHEY: If someone was to submit plans to do that and neighbor found out, they could go ahead and -- they can downzone their property and the other -- the other owner is out of luck?

MR. TEDDY: I think we'd look at when the permit was submitted. I mean, if the permit is submitted and reviewed under the existing zoning or the previously existing zoning -- you can't apply it retroactively to a site. But if there was some -- if there was some period of time between the rezoning to downzone a parcel and then the lot. Yeah, it would -- it would -- at the time the permit is submitted, we would look at the existing zoning environment and make comments on what would be required based on that.

MR. TOOHEY: Okay.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other questions of staff? Okay.

MS. BURNS: I would just like to echo what Mr. Ott said as far as the trash in the alleys and how that -- that could or will be managed. And I appreciate staff willing to look into that and kind of anticipate because I see it becoming a larger problem and I really have to wonder when these buildings are occupied if there isn't a plan on the table or something that's required, what's going to happen.

MR. REICHLIN: Mr. Strodman?

MR. STRODTMAN: I wanted to kind of also echo that and -- and include deliveries. I think we've

discussed the deliveries in the street parking, and I don't know if that's being factored in as to how those delivery trucks can park and where they can park and -- and not, you know, block the alleys, but still also not block the main streets.

MR. ZENNER: I believe a number of the issue as it relates to redevelopment in the MDT and the alley system that we currently have, part of -- part of the deficiency that we have within our downtown is we have 15-foot-wide alleys that don't necessarily provide the level of service that is necessary in order to be able to accommodate trash collection, deliveries, and a variety of other activity that an alley in a urban area normally would. If I recall correctly, a lot of this is addressed in the redevelopment scenario of the MDT parcels themselves with a required rear setback, the preservation of alleys and then potentially the opening of new alleys in those locations that don't have any. I mean, it's a finite resource that we have and it's potentially a finite opportunity based upon full-block or large-parcel or land-holding redevelopment. But I believe we do have within the MDT a couple of provisions that exist about establishment of setbacks for the purposes of ensuring that the alley functions the way that it -- at least envisioned by Farrell Madden, was intended to. But because of how they're platted, they don't today. So to the issue of sanitary collection, I understand the point. It is something that with every building plan, our solid waste staff is engaged in the review prior to the final plans generally being approved. That may not be satisfying all trash being generated by the building, but it is -- it's an activity that may be just not at the level that it needs to be at to ensure that we're addressing the broader problem. And we'll come back when we do the MDT. We may be able to give you a better idea of how redevelopment may impact rear alley access for development and the ability to provide better circulation pattern within the downtown to address potentially some of the issues.

MR. REICHLIN: Shall we call ourselves complete with this portion of the meeting? Fair assessment? Do we want to take a break before we go further, or do we want to just wrap this up?

MS. RUSSELL: Move.

MR. REICHLIN: Okay. Keep going.

## **VI) PUBLIC HEARING**

### **Case No. 16-103**

**A request by A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of their client, 1103, LLC (owner) for a major revision of the Lake Broadway Condominiums PUD to accommodate on-site signage. The proposed amendment would permit a 32-square-foot on-site identification sign to be installed on the existing fence near the property's Broadway entrance. The subject site contains 5.17 acres, is developed with 58 residential units, and addressed as 1103-1121 W. Broadway Street.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the PUD amendment as requested.

MR. REICHLIN: Are there any questions of staff? Mr. Harder [sic]?

MR. TOOHEY: What's their reason for doing this now? They didn't do it when they --

MR. PALMER: Well, just to increase advertisement, I guess. It might be something we can ask Kevin, who is here from the –

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Toohey, if your question is why are we amending the plan, it is -- if you do not state signage within a planned zone per our sign code, you are -- you have to comply with the underlying zoning district's requirements. So the underlying zoning district requirement for an R-2 subdivision would specify that you could have a 32-square-foot sign no greater than six feet in height. However, you have to meet the ten feet behind the road right-of-way standard. So had it been ten feet behind the road right-of-way, you would not be seeing this. We would have required it as a minor amendment. But since it is encroaching and asking for a reduction in the underlying zoning requirements for signage, you are having to, in essence, approve the setback variance which is really more driving the process, not the sign. They would have been permitted to have the sign had they met the setback. And, yes, it was not addressed on the original plan. It may not have been contemplated as necessary; however, signage is somewhat of a given for residential subdivisions if you want it, and they would like it at this point. They consider themselves, I imagine, a subdivision.

MR. REICHLIN: Any other questions of staff? At this time, I'll open up the public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. MURPHY: Good evening, again, Commissioners. Kevin Murphy, A Civil Group, at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. To answer Mr. Toohey's question, this -- this project is an R-2 PUD which predates -- I don't know -- it predates me. It was probably zoned in the '80s when they had a just -- again, different types of zonings. It was a very nominal plan that was done at that time. I'm not even sure that the sign regulations were that clear or even if we had them at that time, but -- and anyway, its previous owners had not done anything with this. A previous client of ours, for him, we had to -- we revised that plan because we did a bit of a layout. Again we had to create a whole new plan and -- and basically did that as a -- as a minor revision because the -- the old plan again was so nominal, just really just elevations of buildings and what they would look like and some raw placement of them. So that is the plan then from 2007 that we're amending, and the property has since been sold to the client that we're doing this for now and -- and he is desiring to have some -- some signage up there. We had originally thought of having it downlighted, but we discussed it and -- and the location that it's at. We have the fence there. There's a -- probably a four- or five-foot berm behind that fence, and -- and several pine trees on that, and that would be -- you really couldn't see the sign behind the fence. There's an island in the shared driveway that it is set back behind that fence, as well, so you really wouldn't be able to see any -- be seen until you get right on it to turn there. But, basically, it's for deliveries, for, you know, a little bit of advertisement, I guess, but to let folks realize where this is at. The driveway just gets overlooked sometimes and that's what he's wishing to do. Again -- oh, as far as the lighting, we've decided to do kind of a backlighting or glow-type lighting. There would be a -- a backboard and then the lights will actually reflect off of the back of the letters onto the board, so it'll kind of more glow versus shining out or shining down onto the sign, and we just thought that would look a little bit nicer. But that's all I had to say. If have

any more questions?

MR. REICHLIN: Any questions of this speaker? Seeing no one, thank you, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody else in the audience wishing to comment on this matter. Seeing no one, I'll close the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. REICHLIN: Open this matter up to my fellow Commissioners. Anybody wishing to comment, frame a motion? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: The signage appears to meet current regulations with the exception of the setback through no fault of the current owner. Therefore, I'd propose to move to approve, unless someone else would care to comment. So in the Case of 16-103, request by Civil Group, move to approve the major revision to the Lake Broadway Condominium PUD to accommodate on-site signage with a variance to the requirement for the ten-foot setback.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

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

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns. Motion carries 8-0.**

MS. LOE: We have eight votes for. The motion carries. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

MR. REICHLIN: Thank you, Ms. Loe. Yes?

MS. LOE: I have a point of clarification. I have a vote sheet in here for Case 16-110, which was the request of City of Columbia to adopt the uniform --

MR. ZENNER: That is -- you can disregard that one.

MS. LOE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: Unless you're really adventuresome and you'd like to approve it.

MS. LOE: Disregard.

MR. REICHLIN: No. Let's not -- let's not go there tonight. Okay.

MR. ZENNER: But we could avoid five more meetings if you'd like. I have no problem.

**VII) COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC**

MR. REICHLIN: Anybody? Nobody.

**VIII) COMMENTS OF STAFF**

MR. ZENNER: Well, I tried giving you guys another vacation, but I can't. Your next meeting will be May 19th. The meeting will begin again at 6:00 p.m. We will be covering the next installment of the Unified Development Code process, Module One's content, Zoned Districts and Uses, as we discussed this evening. You will have a regular work session at 5:30 again like today, so we will -- we will continue to progress forward with those meetings as we move into the future. Initially, we were not going to have

any other business items on the 19th's agenda; however, with the tabling of 16-101 today, that will show up under your subdivisions, so that will be the Cherry Street Parking Garage subdivision plat. And then we will have our two-hour work session or our two-hour information and comment session on the Unified Development Code, and that will complete our meeting. There are no public hearings scheduled for the 19th, and that is all we really have for this evening. Thank you for your patience and your understanding with the presentations this evening. Expect the same, maybe a little bit shorter at the next meeting.

**IX) COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS**

MR. REICHLIN: Any comments of Commissioners? I just wanted to say for the record I am not going to be present for the May 19th meeting. I think I've made Mr. Zenner aware of that already. In my absence, I'm hoping Mr. Strodtman will step in. That said, let's make sure we communicate with staff regarding our presence or absence so we know where we are well before that Thursday.

MR. ZENNER: We are two down. Ms. Russell will be gone on the 19th, if I am correct, and then, Mr. Reichlin, you will be gone, so we are coming close to a quorum-related issue. We have one more Commissioner that may be absent before we are at our minimum quorum.

MR. REICHLIN: Well, that said --

MR. ZENNER: If something arises, please let me know as quickly as you possibly can.

MR. STRODTMAN: I'm available.

MR. REICHLIN: Okay. All right. Great.

**X) ADJOURNMENT**

MR. REICHLIN: With that, I'll entertain a motion for adjournment.

MS. BURNS: Move to adjourn.

MR. TOOHEY: Second.

MR. REICHLIN: Thumbs up?

**(Unanimous vote for approval.)**

MR. REICHLIN: Have a good night.

(Off the record.)

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