



## Columbia Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Recap

Council Chambers, Columbia City Hall  
7:00 PM Thursday, August 10, 2017

<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>	(All members present.)
<b>APPROVAL OF AGENDA</b>	(Approved as submitted.)
<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>	( <a href="#">Minutes from July 20, 2017</a> approved as submitted.)

### TABLING REQUESTS

#### Case # 17-169

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of G&L Holdings of Missouri (owner), for approval of a PD Plan to be known as "Tower Drive Industrial Park PD Plan" and a design adjustment to allow a longer stem for a driveway to proposed Lot 3B. The subject 11-acre lot is located at the terminus of Tower Drive, north of Prathersville Road.

(Action: Request to table. Applicant indicated that they are making changes to the original plan based on staff input.)

**Motion to table until August 24, 2017 granted unanimously.**

### SUBDIVISIONS

#### Case # 17-167

A request by Allstate Consultants, LLC (agent) on behalf of Arrowhead 3, LLC (owner) for approval of a 4-lot final plat on R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) zoned land, to be known as "Arrowhead Lake Estates Plat 3", pending annexation and rezoning, and a design adjustment related to sensitive areas. The 26.72-acre subject site is located approximately 1,200 feet north of Sinclair Road on the east side of West Lake Arrowhead Drive.

(Action: Staff report presented. This is a request for replatting and is subject to positive action on requests to annex and rezone the subject property. Staff believes that the underlying request is appropriate and meets general requirements. However, a design adjustment is being requested that would allow the applicant to place sensitive and protected areas within the subject site in preservation easements, rather than create separate common lots for those areas. The rationale is that the easements would allow maintenance of the areas by the lot owner rather than relegate that responsibility to a homeowners' association. The areas are located in the backyards of the properties in question and will not create obvious conflicts with the intent of the rules. While the request does not meet the specific criteria for granting such permission, the request is in keeping with the general intent of the rule. Monuments will be installed on the property to identify the boundaries of such protected areas and the buildable area of each lot is clearly identified on the plans and will be recorded as such.

Large acreage lots present small chance for conflict with requirements, but staff is asking for alternative standards and have identifies allowable building envelopes on the lot. Preservation easements are also identified. One steep slope area identified. Staff recommends approval with the mentioned design changes and conditions.

Rushing asked if southern lot has lake access. Staff indicated that that lot was a stem lot and was still located in the county, so did not know about its access to the lake. Rushing also asked about preservation enforcement. Staff indicated that it would be complaint driven but that there was a preservation easement in place. Rushing thought it would be easy for a future property owner to not know about an existing preservation easement. Commission asked if new building permits clearly identify preservation easements during the building process. Staff indicated that the property owner is supposed to be knowledgeable about the restrictions and staff indicated that there are no physical demarcations. Staff indicated that easements are recorded on the plat and should be reflected on any surveys.

Loe asked about the building envelope and indicated that that is the exterior of the building. Indicated that the new UDC has a definition of building area, but not building envelope. Staff said that COULD be the case, but what is referred to in the code is "building envelope" and it is shown as a line on the plan. Staff is using the term "building envelope" synonymously with the term "buildable area". (Section 29-5.1 (b) 2). MacMann asked if buildings could go right up to the building envelope line. Staff indicated that it could and that the line shown by default becomes the building line. Moving forward, you may want to create an offset for easements to clarify the setbacks.

Public comment was opened.

Speaker indicated that he represented the applicant LLC. Being the first proposal all the way through under the new code has been challenging and we appreciate the staff work. No questions for the speaker.

Public comment was closed.)

**Motion to approve the proposal was approved unanimously 9 - 0.**

#### **Case # 17-178**

A request by Brush and Associates (agent), on behalf of Christina and Jerold Wilson (owners), for approval of a 2-lot minor subdivision to be known as "Northern Heights Plat 2-A" and design modifications related to sidewalk installation and right of way dedication requirements for residential streets.

The 0.55 acres subject property is located at 2906 and 2908 Flora Drive.

(Action: Staff report presented. Existing property has existed in current condition since construction in the 1960's, at which time the property was located in the county. The two homes on the property are set back 30', but proximity of parcels precludes the construction of a cul de sac according to specifications since it would impinge on existing buildings. There are no sidewalks in the area and construction of such would require further space and the crossing of a creek to connect. Staff believes that the application meets the exemptions rules and supports the application as proposed.

MacMann asked about location of sewer. Staff indicated that the easements shown on the plan allow for connection to a common collector sewer line.

Public comment was opened.

Engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant and offered to answer questions. None were forthcoming. No further discussion ensued.)

**Motion to approve passed unanimously 9 -0.**

**Case # 17-183**

A request by Engineering Surveys and Services (agent), on behalf of Columbia College (owner), for approval of a 1-lot minor subdivision to be known as "Columbia College North Subdivision" and a design adjustment to the required half-width dedication requirements for Rangeline Street. The subject 1.44-acre parcel is contiguous with Columbia College properties north of Wilkes Boulevard, between Range Line Street and Eighth Street.

(Action: Staff report presented as indicated. MacMann indicated that he had attended a master planning session and that local neighbors and he had discussed the issue prior to consideration of tonight's discussion. Basically, this request combines small legal lots that were remnants into a single lot so the property may be utilized without building over lot lines. Such a replat is required according to that rule. The existing building in the area actually violates that new rule and they expect to come back later and replat that area but are waiting on future land acquisition to streamline the future request. The applicant further requested the ability to provide a smaller half-width than indicated since it will match existing conditions for surrounding properties and the basic goals of road designed can still be achieved. Staff supports the application.

Burns asked about the presentations and indicated that some looked like one parking lot sliced into an existing building. Staff asked for the applicant to amend the drawing to accommodate the odd configuration of the remnant properties and that accounted for the apparent contradiction. MacMann asked about some existing non-conformities but staff indicated they are legal non-conformities and will be addressed in the future.

Public comment was opened.

Speaker indicated that he was an engineer representing the applicant and further indicated that there is no current plan for the referenced future properties. No further testimony.)

**Motion to approve the application was accepted unanimously 9 -0.**

**Case #17-187**

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of Campus Lutheran Church (owner) for approval of a one-lot replat of R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) zoned property, to be known as the final plat of "Campus Lutheran" and a design adjustment to the half-width right of way dedication requirements for College Avenue. The 1.91-acre subject site is located at the northeast corner of College Avenue and Anthony Street, and addressed as 304 S. College Avenue.

(Action: Staff report was presented as indicated. Indicated that the request to consolidate all existing lots on the site into a single lot so that redevelopment could go forward reasonably and would also include a vacated alley which is being pursued as a separate action. The half width right-of-way requirement is being asked to be waived and such request matches existing construction and road plans in this area of town.

Public comment was opened.

Engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant. Although this site is not within the boundaries of the East Campus Neighborhood, the applicant did reach out and received no negative input. Comments were closed and no further questions were forthcoming.)

**Motion to approve was accepted unanimously 9 – 0.**

**Case # 17-195**

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Woodland Hills Properties, LLC (owner), for approval of a 1-lot final plat to be known as "Copperstone Plat 7A". The proposed plat will consolidate Lots 102A and 217A of Copperstone Plat 7. The subject parcels are located at the intersection of Silver Valley Drive and Copperstone Creek Drive and contain 0.93 total acres.

(Action: Staff report presented as indicated.)

Discussion about title indicated that no design modifications were required.)

**Motion to approve was accepted unanimously 9 -0.**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Case # 17-170**

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of AMW Investment Properties, LLC (owner) for approval of PD zoning and associated PD plan to be known as "Sidra Subdivision PD Plan". The 0.86-acre site is located at the northeast corner of Primrose Drive and North Stadium Boulevard. (This item was tabled at the July 20, 2017 meeting)

(Action: Staff report presented as indicated. This is a Planned Development request and had been previously tabled. It consists of a five-unit attached single family arrangement, but the new rules only allow for four attached units, so the applicant opted for Planned Development designation. There are some constraints regarding street access, but there is sufficient land to achieve the requested configuration. Topography and existing street configurations did not reflect the new rules and the new plan reflects the intent of the new rule by providing access and the plan retains all screening requirements. By following the current regulations, it could negatively impact detention and parking rules. Sidewalks are being accommodated and parking provided exceeds requirements as does the screening. If this is approved it will require a future replat to include a new right of way easement along Stadium. It meets all other rules regarding proximity to single family dwellings.

MacMann asked about input from neighbors. Staff indicated that there had been questions about the view of rear patios on the new plan. Developer added some screening to block the rear view of the buildings. Strodman asked why more parking than required was being provided. Staff indicated that this was provided to avoid on-street parking options. Staff indicated that if this were a traditional single-family configuration, the driveways to each unit would probably have provided as much driveway/parking area and no benefit would have been achieved.

Rushing indicated that the original request was for 6 lots. Staff indicated that the plan had been amended to accommodate on site detention. Sidewalks are shown on this plan all the way around the lots. Statement of intent will be amended.

Public hearing was opened.

Engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant. Confirmed that the original plan DID ask for 6 units and that the change was the reason for the original tabling request. Current R-2 zoning would allow for development of this property, but this new plan was a little better in terms of compliance with screening and detention, but asks for some allowances regarding street frontage. Loe asked about usable green space for neighbors. Engineer indicated that the green space would be shared by all neighbors and no unique backyards would be identified.

Next speaker indicated that he thought the neighborhood was lovely but asked about the density issue as it relates to traffic. Believes that this could create a bottleneck at this particular location since there is a yield sign and people are moving quickly. Also asked about on-site detention. Believed that this is just an eroded piece of ground with a tree in it and it could be an eyesore. Commissioners indicated that it would be a dry area most of the time and that there was a pipe to the area. Speaker asked about sidewalks. Commission indicated that there were sidewalks on three sides.

Next speaker expressed concerns about how it looks. Indicated that the first thing she will see when she enters the subdivision will be a parking lot and a detention pond. Thought the aesthetics were lacking. These could become rentals. Also indicated that a lot of the ground was becoming impervious and that the onsite detention was not sufficient. Commission indicated that the landscaping did meet requirements and that this plan only offers 5 units instead of the 6 that could be built under other plans. Engineers have determined that stormwater facilities meet the standard. Strodman described the look and nature of the detention basins and the operation of such typical facilities. Staff added that what people will see is basically a depression in the ground at that location and that it has been engineered to prevent more runoff than currently occurs on that piece of ground. Staff indicated that it could have grass or native plants, but that it could also be included as open space for the people who live there. Speaker then asked why this was being changed from R-2 to PD? Why do we have zoning in the first place if it can change? Commission indicated that there could have been more intense development here (slightly) and that this application actually fixes some problems that would have been manifested under the currently allowed use. Staff indicated that if you flipped this around you could see the comparative plan and that this provided a good option. Further discussion about parking on driveways vs. parking lots was discussed and that there are some advantages to this arrangement vs. three driveways onto Rashid. Strodman also indicated that most traffic here will not be generated by these five homes, but by the other homes in the area.

Next speaker indicated that they owned homes just north of this area. He indicated that he was concerned about the potential loss of access to some property they owned if any changes ever occur to Stadium. We are the ones who are going to be looking at the patios and the barbecue grills in back yards. We have been there 50 years and we don't get the same weight as the developers when they come in. Those contractors are going to come in, build right next to each other and it will not look good. Commissioner Strodman indicated that the city will not take away access to their property, no matter what happens. The grade of the places that exist now could change and so there will be landscaping that could offset the changes that will occur. You won't necessarily be seeing all the back patios because of the drop in grade. Also indicated that it would be nice if the new places could face the golf course across the street, but that other rules precluded that as well. The speaker indicated that they offered to sell to the developer but they did not take them up on the deal. Commissioners indicated that they do not take that kind of information into account.

Next speaker indicated that the developers said that the buildings would be 35' high in the back and that patios in the back will be visible to the adjoin neighbors and that there are already some places along there that the neighbors already see and hear all the fights that happen there. Commissioner indicated that despite the height of the building, it may be affected by the drop in elevation. Also, indicated that the back patios will be smaller than you may expect. Speaker asked if engineers could give a briefing on landscaping. Stanton asked what the speaker would like as relief. Speaker indicated she would like a fence and that there are just too many people can go roaming through other people's yards and that they already hear everybody's fights. There is a big gas station nearby and everyone cuts through that yard. Commissioners asked if the speaker lived at that address. She indicated that she did not live there, but she owned the property. Also indicated that she was not a member of the neighborhood association.

No further public comment or discussion.)

**Motion to approve accepted unanimously 9 - 0**

**Case # 17-188**

A request by McClure Engineering Company (agent) on behalf of the City of Columbia (owner) for approval of a PD Plan to be known as "Clary-Shy Agriculture Park PD Plan" and associated Statement of Intent. The 17.21-acre subject property is located at the northwest corner of Ash Street and Clinkscals Road.

(Action: Commissioner Burns indicated that she had made a financial contribution to this project but received nothing in return for her support. Staff report indicated that this is a city-owned property that has had several levels of planning and promotion in the community. It will be used as a farmer's market, an educational facility site, on-site agriculture, a green house, park uses such as trails and parking. One exception was noted regarding landscaping. Staff explained that the new regulations would make them screen a school from a park, despite its real use, and that although it seems intuitive, some of the multiple uses trigger the screening requirements. Staff believes that minimum parking will be maintained. Signage was originally proposed to be larger, but staff asked them to scale that back to be more consistent with existing ARC signage.

Rushing asked if the small drive on the north would be maintained. Staff indicated that that was correct. Further asked about parking access. Staff indicated that that would be preserved. Rushing asked if existing buildings would be displaced. After discussion, it was determined that there was not a conflict.

Public comment was opened.

Speaker indicated that he was the campaign director for the private side of this public/private partnership. Believed that this would be a perfect complement to the existing ARC facility in terms of promoting a healthy lifestyle. Discussed the importance of urban agriculture and the validity of the project. Described the partnership of this project which included the City of Columbia, the Columbia Famers Market, the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture and sustainable agriculture groups. The city will continue to own the land. Described the funding structure for the project and the contributions of key non-profit groups.

Next speaker indicated that he was the architect for the project. Gave more details about the buildings to be located on site. Indicated that the main building would be a farmer's market and would be served with parking and access as well as outdoor storage of mulch, outdoor classrooms, an associated

educational building and an outdoor playground. There will also be 3.5 acres of orchards and growing area as well as walking trails throughout the site. Existing sports fields will be maintained for now and a meeting building will be constructed on site. Secondary parking could be constructed if needed. On site detention facility will serve the whole site.

Next speaker appeared on behalf of the Farmer's Market. Indicated that this has been the use since 1980 and the market has continued to grow over the years. We have requirements for local participation and expect higher usage as these improvements occur. We also believe these improvements will allow us to utilize the ground year-round.

Speaker indicated that he represented the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture. This is a great chance for expansion and service to the city. Last year, we grew 14,000 pounds of food, and all of it was donated to the Food Bank. This extends our ability to serve. We will triple our ability to provide food; we can accommodate more extension and education programs; and it will complement the fitness goals at the ARC. Indicated that they currently with West School. Also indicated that they work with the Community Gardens program, although they are separate.

Representative of the city appeared to indicate how the public process has occurred over the years in terms of approval, public input and pedestrian access. North Central neighborhood input has been positive. This solves overflow parking issues for the ARC and Farmers Market at different times; it completes a fitness loop on the property; and allows for the future expansion of the ARC, whenever that may occur. City mows, picks up trash and regulates hours of use. Facilities could be rented to private parties when not used by regular programming. Maintenance costs will change over time. City will address homelessness and vagrancy on site through monitoring and police. Trash will be handled like other parks. ARC will be responsible for their own.

Speaker is an engineer and supports the plan. Indicated that signage will be slightly larger that will combine signage for both the ARC and the Farmers Market and will establish another sign with an address on the other side of the park at the request of public safety. The Pavilion will have signage for sponsor organizations and smaller directional signs meet requirements. We have created controlled access on fire lane to reduce conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. Working with fire department to get this right. Lots of walking trails and easy access to all parts of the park. Exceptions are all noted on the plan and have been created in consultation with city staff.

Rushing asked how close they were financially to starting construction. Speaker indicated that plans will be submitted in October. Indicated there is one dumpster location near main building. Admitted that there are some solid waste disposal issues that they are still working through. Indicated that this is an entirely open building, but that there will be some plastic screens for use in inclement weather. Indicated that they really don't know what fencing will look like around this property, but that they may be able to grow some kinds of crops on that fence. Question from Loe about phasing of project. First phase is the main farmers market building. Then we extend parking and other amenities. We cannot use the public school parking due to legal reasons. There will be conflicts in parking on Saturday mornings, but we do not want to overwhelm the site with parking.

Next speaker indicated she lived in the neighborhood and supported the project, particularly trail connectivity and the nature of the project.

Next speaker represented the Farmer's Market and believed that it has incorporated lots of different entities and we have provided lots of fresh fruits and vegetables but we can do better.

No further speakers.

Commission asked about bus service and why that was not included. Staff indicated that there is current connectivity and that that may change. No further discussion.

**Motion to approve accepted unanimously 9 – 0.**

**COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC**

**(None.)**

**COMMENTS OF THE STAFF**

Zenner indicated that they will discuss Planned Zoning at the next worksession.

At the next regular meeting, the Commission will discuss four subdivision items including Burks, Perche Ridge, McGary and University Centre.

There could be three public hearing items including: Caulder Brooks, Tower Drive, and Perche Ridge Annexation although some of these could be removed from the agenda if some preliminary aspects of the proposals cannot be worked out in advance.

**COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSION**

**(None.)**

**NEXT MEETING DATE** - August 24, 2017 @ 7 pm

**ADJOURNMENT**

**(Time: Approximately 9:45 PM)**

© 2017 CityWatch-Columbia

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