



Columbia Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Recap

Council Chambers, Columbia City Hall
7:00 PM Thursday, June 8, 2017

CALL TO ORDER (Members Present: Strodman, Burns, MacMann, Stanton, Russell, Harder, Toohey)
(Members Absent: Rushing, Loe)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Agenda changed to consider tabling of **Case # 17-132**)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Minutes from May 18, 2017 approved.)

WITHDRAWN ITEMS

Case # 17-107

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of Bristol Lake Home Owners Association Number 1, Inc. (owner) to annex 0.79 acres into the City of Columbia and apply R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) as permanent zoning. The subject site is located approximately 500 feet east of Bearfield Road, 1,300 feet north of Gans Road, and north of Lot C4 of Bristol Lake Plat 1 subdivision.

(Action: Item withdrawn.)

TABLING REQUESTS

Case # 17-128

A request by A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of Discovery Park Apartments, LLC (owner) for a major amendment to the "Lots 4 & 5 Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 2B" PD (Planned Development) Development Plan approved on 1/27/15, to be known as "Lots 4, 5, & 5A Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 2C" PD Plan. The 17.55-acre subject property is located at the southwest corner of Nocona Parkway and Ponderosa Street. (Applicant is requesting that this item be tabled to the June 22, 2017 meeting)

(Action: Item tabled until June 22, 2017.)

Case # 17-132

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of Phil and Erin Teeple (owners) to rezone 4206 Savoy Drive from R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) and A (Agricultural) to R-MF (Multiple-family Dwelling District). The 3.99-acre subject site is located on the east side of Strawn

Road, approximately 900 feet north of Worley Street.

(Petition with approximately 120 names filed in opposition to this request. Signers of the petition are residents of the general area affected.)

([Map of area available at this link.](#))

(Applicant requested tabling of this request until June 22 in order to hold a meeting with the homeowners' association.)

(Action: Chairman indicated that he would like to limit public input until the next meeting if they table this item. If you DON'T want us to table this item, then speak tonight. If not hold comments until the next meeting unless that is not possible. Audience indicated that they would like to address the group tonight.

First speaker indicated that he represented Vintage Falls and that he opposed the project and the tabling. Wants to have the discussion tonight. Does not have any sufficient information to go forward and recommends denial and is opposed to tabling. MacMann disclosed that he had had discussions with one HOA member and with Mr. Crockett about this item.

Next speaker indicated that he represented HOA Vintage Falls Phase Two. He said there was a possibility that this could be tabled tonight but was not informed of that until 4 PM yesterday. He is opposed to tabling this item at this time.

Stanton indicated that he thought this was an unusual request, but that he generally preferred more time to talk to get a win-win solution.

No representative of the applicant showed up because they had asked to table this. Stanton indicates that the commission does allow two tablings, and that it might be silly that no one showed up from the applicant, but that this has been an accepted practice in the past. Chairman indicated that it appeared that the neighbors were done talking, but that they could still consider tabling this item tonight.

Toohy asked if we go ahead with this tonight, we could discuss it and send our recommendation on to the council for a final decision. **Stanton wants both sides to be heard, so favors tabling tonight generally. Stanton moved forward with a motion to table the motion until June 22.**

Russell asked that we should add a requirement to this motion to notify the homeowners groups who DID show up. Motion was amended to reflect that idea.

Motion to table passed 5 to 2 with MacMann and Burns dissenting.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 17-74

A request by RUM, Inc. (owner) for approval of a C-P (Planned Business District) development plan/preliminary plat to be known as "Centerstate Apartments C-P Plan & Preliminary Plat". The 36.37-acre subject site is located on the north side of Vandiver Drive, west of Woodard Drive and south of Pioneer Drive.

(Action: Staff presented a report on this project and indicated that it would be considered under the old zoning code rules since it was a complete application prior to the adoption of the new zoning code, but

complex review processes prevented it from coming forward for approval until now. The parcel was the subject of prior rezoning in 2004 when the property was rezoned from O-P to C-P with basic uses reflecting C-3 permitted uses. This application would establish a formal development plan and serve as the preliminary plat for this property. The site will accommodate 304 apartment units on Lot 1, reserve Lots 2 & 3 for commercial purposes, and Lots 4 & 5 will become park land donated/sold to the city. Roadways are sufficient to handle this development. Signage will be limited. An additional 100 trees will be planted on the property for buffering. 37% of the property will be developed, the rest will be open space of some sort. A 100' buffer will be maintained between this property and the residential properties located along Pioneer Drive. All other subdivision screening, parking and setback requirements existing under the old code have been reviewed and met and staff recommends approval.

MacMann asked if the arborist recommendations were appropriate and staff indicated that this was correct. Also asked if city will manage bioretention pond on the land that will be transferred to the city? Staff indicated that there will be some agreement for maintenance, however, the city did want a water feature in this park. Also, indicated that off-site bioretention is allowed, but that this will be governed by a maintenance agreement.

Chairman asked if Albert-Oakland Park was the nearest park and that was confirmed by staff. Staff also indicated that this is a desirable location for additional park land since we are underserved in this area. Improvement of the parkland is not budgeted, but the purchase price of some of the land is covered.

Public comment was opened.

Speaker appeared on behalf of project from Allstate Consultants. Emphasized that these units are not student and are all market rate. It is NOT bioretention, it is a park water feature and the city will maintain that property. If it had been bioretention it would have been different. MacMann asked if this was really needed for detention. Engineer indicated that it was needed, but it was designed according to the wishes of the city park staff. Chairman asked about parking for guests. Speaker indicated that there is a small clubhouse and that there is a pool included in the project.

Attorney appeared on behalf of the applicant. Indicated that he could answer any questions relating to the existing TDD and a verbal agreement with Menards regarding this proposal and that any private agreements are outside the purview of this hearing. Commissioner asked if the TDD required any assessments or additional taxes on the apartments. Speaker indicated that it would not affect those properties in that manner.

Next speaker indicated that she is an area resident, but that she had some concerns about density and recreation facilities for residents. Believed that there were too many apartments on too few acres. Believed that it was wrong to have people living in close proximity to major roads and the UPS facility that regularly receives 18-wheeler trucks. Speaker believed that pedestrian safety was compromised in this instance and that this did not match the Vision Zero concepts recently adopted. Speaker also feared that there was still not enough recreational facilities for kids who live in this area, although she did not know the details about the new park land. Also, criticized the lack of sidewalks in this neighborhood.

Speaker indicated that he lived in the general area and that over time this entire area had changed. Asked about walkability of the area. Will there be a trail or sidewalk built on private property or along an unimproved street and will there be a sidewalk to nowhere? Also asked if the sidewalks would be built under the powerlines. Commission indicated that sidewalks would end at the property edge.

Speaker indicated that he was the president of the Mexico Gravel Road Neighborhood Association. Indicated he had spoken to no one about this project. He indicated that the association had some concern about the 304 apartments. Believed that the road was NOT big enough to handle this traffic load since there is truck parking along the road. Believed that safety is a consideration. Wondered what happened if this apartment does not take off. Indicated that developments in the north part of town don't have a good track record and does not want it to become a rundown property. Clarified that Allstate was great originally and that the association simply had some concerns. Stanton asked for specific concerns. Speaker indicated that the park idea is good. Questioned the need for more apartments. Speaker said he feared that a lot of apartments in the north end of town became low-income housing and that he had some concerns about that.

Speaker indicated that he was a young investor in this community. Spoke in favor of the kind of housing being proposed. Thought it was a good idea, particularly for young, non-students.

Allstate speaker returned and indicated that the density of this development was not intensive since it was only 37% developed. The sidewalk plan and trail plan was created in tandem with the city, and all sidewalks and trails are paved and the sidewalks are on both private and public easements. Applicant granted additional right-of-way for the road. Was not sure where sidewalks are located in relation to overhead powerlines.

Stanton indicated that he believed there is a real need for one and two bedroom affordable apartments and that this area is appropriate. It's a good buffer from the commercial and industrial uses around it. Russell indicated that she agreed with Stanton and that she would also support this proposal.

**Motion to approve this item was made by Russell.
Motion approved unanimously.)**

COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC

First speaker indicated that she had originally come to talk about a tabled item. Wanted to know when the request for tabling was received. Commissioners indicated that they first learned of the request this evening. Speaker asked if when this comes back it will be the same or different and how will the public know what changes, if any, have been made? Commission indicated that major changes might be discussed and that the same report will be submitted at the next meeting unless they have additional information. It is possible that changes could occur on the night of the meeting and another tabling could occur. It depends on what happens between the neighborhood and developer between now and then. Staff indicated that they can't just pull everyone off of one case and put them on another but that they will do the best they can, and the deadlines are about a week in advance of the actual meeting. Encouraged both sides to reach out to make sure that there was some framework for the next discussion.

No additional public comments were presented.

COMMENTS OF THE STAFF

At the next meeting, there will be several items discussed.

Vineyards Plat One
Mill Creek Meadows

Discovery Park Plat 2C
Savoy Drive Rezone
Columbia Indoor Sports Complex

There will be no work session prior to the regular meeting.

COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSION
(None.)

NEXT MEETING DATE - June 22, 2017 @ 7 pm

ADJOURNMENT
(Time: 8:35 PM)

© 2017 CityWatch-Columbia

(This document may not be reproduced, redistributed or significantly cited in other works without the written permission of the author.)

DO NOT COPY