



Columbia Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Recap

Council Chambers, Columbia City Hall
7:00 PM Thursday, September 21, 2017

CALL TO ORDER (Members present: Loe, Burns, MacMann, Strodman, Toohey, Rushing, Russell, Stanton.)

(Members absent: Harder)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Moved public hearing 17-211 up in the agenda ahead of the final subdivision hearings on Overton property. Change approved.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES ([Minutes from September 7, 2017](#) meeting approved as submitted.)

TABLING REQUEST

Case # 17-76

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of Michael Charles Caulder (owner) to annex 161.84 acres of Boone County A-R (Agricultural Residential District) zoned land into the City of Columbia and apply R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District) as permanent zoning. The subject site is located on the north side of State Route WW, approximately 900 feet west of S. Rolling Hills Road. (The applicant has requested that this item be tabled to the October 19, 2017 Commission meeting. This is the applicant's second tabling request.)

(Action: Applicant explained that he needed more time to work out some elements of a separate annexation agreement with the city before finalizing this zoning action. After brief discussion, the motion was made to agree to table this item until the October 19, 2017 meeting.

Motion to table until October 19 passed unanimously.)

SUBDIVISIONS

Case # 17-101

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of Gates Real Estate, LLC (owner) for approval of a 193-lot preliminary plat revision on R-1 (On-family Dwelling District) zoned property, to be known as The Gates Preliminary Plat No. 3. The 120-acre subject site is generally located south of Old Plank Road, and south of Wentworth Drive.

(Action: Staff report indicated that this revision to a previously approved preliminary plat would reduce the number of common lot areas, increase the size of some residential lots that previously abutted the common areas and would now include lots in this plat that are next to land already acquired by the City for park uses. Those lots had not previously been included in the preliminary plat. The elimination of the

common lots is justifiable since they are not needed for stormwater uses, and, if at a future date some common lots are desired or needed, they can be added back in without major revision to the preliminary plat. Because this application was originally submitted before the passage of the new UDO, it is being considered under the zoning rules in place prior to March 21, 2017. Staff recommends approval.

Public comment was opened.

Engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant. Indicated that there had been some earlier discussions about parkland and this request makes use of those land parcels that were not obtained as parkland. Indicated that adding some common lots to residential lots helps avoid common liability for dead trees etc., but does not take away any common lots already promised to homeowners. Also, indicated that all stormwater ordinances could be met with the available land remaining in common ownership.

No further discussion.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.)

Case # 17-216

A request by Central Counties Surveying (agent), on behalf of Wabash Arms of Columbia, LLC (owners), for approval of a 2-lot subdivision to be known as "Athens Subdivision, Plat 1" and a design adjustment from Appendix A.6(b) of the UDC pertaining to lot corner radii. The subject 0.52-acre site is located at the northwest corner of 9th Street and Walnut Street.

(Action: Staff indicated that this request would combine two existing lots located at the northwest corner of Walnut and 9th Streets, then redivide the lots creating one larger lot, and one smaller lot that would facilitate the sale of the second lot. Because this property is located on the corner of Walnut and 9th, the applicant also asks for a waiver of the requirement to truncate the turning radius of the corner. Due to the existing build out of the downtown area, and because it would pose no real threat to public safety, the staff recommends approval of the subdivision request and the waiver.

Rushing asked if the city is changing its policy on the truncation of corners in the downtown area because this is not a singular request. If we are going to build something new then that requirement should be in place so the new building has the proper setback. The old building would not be affected. So, are we really wanting to do this or not? Loe asked if the requirement for truncation would carry forward and NOT apply to this building. Staff indicated that if this variance is approved, future redevelopment would not be bound by the truncation rule because the variance runs with the property. During the UDC hearings, we talked about this truncation rule, but was not included in downtown design parameters for some reason. With no indication of a teardown, we believe the waiver is a practical and reasonable request. The city could ask for more right of way in the future but you may lose parking and incur some additional expense. In the future, this may be one of the amendments we make to the UDO (to eliminate corner truncations). If you give the variance tonight it does apply to the property in the future.) MacMann indicated that this building does have some historical significance, but on a practical level, this truncation requirement should be changed in the code, but we should not delay this general request until we get around to doing that. Staff indicated that you could split this into two parts and approve the subdivision but deny the truncation waiver. Staff pointed out that none of the other corners at this intersection have this truncation. Rushing believed you have to start somewhere, so why not establish this rule now and going forward? Staff indicated that they have allowed this variance at other places downtown, even for the University at opposing corners. So, we need to address this sometime.

Maybe by flagging this in the notes, it will get the attention of city council sooner and they will act on this when they grant approval.

Surveyor appeared on behalf of the applicant and believed that he is the victim of the new zoning code. All they are trying to do is split the property into two parts. They are not going to tear down this building, but they are going to do some historic rehab and cannot get the grants until they get a clear plat. How can ANYONE get a new plat downtown if this is going to be the rule. I believe that I was told that I HAD to ask for this variance to get the plat approved, so which is it. MacMann apologized for the confusion. If we approve this with the design modification, how do we get the council to act on this? Staff indicated that there will be a batch of changes going forward, but it will not be individually addressed right now. They are all going into the kitty and slowly addressed, but we can't put them all in at one time. First batch will probably go in between the last month of this year and the end of the first quarter of 2018. Maybe we can get this addressed once and for all then. Solution to this is to set a standard and follow that without variance or get rid of the rule. Right now, you can ask for administrative authority to grant this variance until we can get a final decision from the council. Staff sees no future road improvements here, so this will not have a big impact due to the pattern of development in downtown and the current placement of buildings. If you recommend denial of the variance, then council will have to make a decision that allows that variance and approval of the subdivision.

Loe asked if the design modification is required for approval of the subdivision. Yes, was the staff answer. The applicant has to show compliance with rules to gain approval of the subdivision. Council could override that recommendation, but this plat, without the corner truncation applied would have to be submitted.

Motion to deny design adjustment for truncation of corner. Made by Loe and seconded by Rushing. Motion to deny carried 6 to 2 meaning the variance is denied.

Motion to approve subdivision plan WITH a truncated corner made by Loe and seconded by Rushing. Motion carried unanimously.

SUBDIVISIONS & PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 17-211

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Stacey Smarr, etal (owners), for approval of a PD plan to be known as "Schilb Antiquarian". The 1.97 acres subject site is located at 2625 S. Providence Road and part of the "Stoney Creek C-P Development Plan." The proposed PD plan includes an office building for Century 21 Advantage Real Estate and a commercial building for use by Schilb Antiquarian.

(Action: Staff report that this property was previously included in a C-P plan for Stoney Creek Inn but was identified as vacant at that time for future development purposes. The new plan would divide the lot into two pieces, with half being occupied by Shilb Antiquarian and the other half featuring an office building (Century 21 office.) Site meets all landscaping, road access and plan rules and regulations. A future replat will be required if this request is approved. Staff recommends approval.

Strodtman asked why the landscaping for this area was not required earlier. Staff indicated the location of some utilities and parking precluded that as a reasonable requirement.

Public hearing was opened.

Engineer appeared on behalf of applicant and described the nature of the two uses asked for here (Shilb Antiquarian and Century 21). Indicated that the original tablings were requested so both could come in at the same time. Further described the nature of the buildings on this site and indicated that a shared driveway and shared access point would be provided. Most parking is in the rear and neither business needs a lot of up front parking. This is infill development and will meet all regulations, and part of the landscaping area is shared parking.

Public hearing was closed and no further discussion ensued.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.)

(FIVE MINUTE RECESS WAS CALLED.)

Case # 17-172

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of Fred Overton Development, Inc. & Andrews ET AL (owners) to annex 54 acres into the City of Columbia and apply R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) as permanent zoning. The subject site is located on the north side of Gillespie Bridge Road, approximately 1,500 feet west of Louisville Drive. (This item was previously tabled at the August 24 and September 7 Planning Commission meetings)

(Action: An extensive staff report was prepared and is summarized as follows: The site is currently located within unincorporated Boone County and is zoned A-2 (Agricultural), which requires a 2.5-acre minimum lot size. In addition, a preliminary plat for the property has been submitted for consideration as case #17-171.

The request includes two separately owned and described parcels, one on the east side of the site that is approximately 37 acres (the Andrews parcel), and the remaining 17 acres on the west side of the site (the Overton parcel). Both owners are requesting R-1 zoning upon annexation on their respective parcels.

The site is bordered on the north, south, and west by property that is currently located in unincorporated Boone County, and is also zoned A-2. The property to the north includes a single family structure and the majority of the parcel is in agricultural use. To the south, the property is similarly utilized, with a single-family dwelling and agricultural uses. A single-family structure is located west of the subject site on an approximately 6-acre parcel, and just to the west of that is a low density residential development in the County, Walnut Wood Estates. The properties in question have contiguity with the City's existing municipal boundary to the east, where it abuts the Westcliff subdivision located on the east side of Perche Creek. Specifically, the Andrews parcel currently has contiguity with the City boundary, and the Overton parcel, which is not currently contiguous, would be contiguous once the Andrews parcel is annexed.

The comprehensive plan's future land use map identifies the property as being located within the "Neighborhood District" on the western portion of the property, with the portion within the floodplain identified as "Open Space/ Greenbelt" areas. In regard to the Andrews parcel, the entirety of the site is located within the floodplain, and the developability of the property is limited given its location. As

such, rezoning the property to R-1 would not be consistent with the current and likely future use of the site, which is agricultural. Zoning the property as R-1 would create a potential nonconforming use on the property since agricultural uses are not permitted in R-1. Staff recommends that the site be zoned A (Agriculture), which is intended for sites that will provide large scale agricultural uses contained within the City. When evaluating the Overton parcel, staff considers the proposed zoning of the site to be consistent with the comprehensive plan's land use designation of the site as a "Neighborhood District". On the west portion of the subject site, the parcel includes property that is not within the floodplain and could be suitable for residential development. The requested R-1 zoning for the site is considered to be consistent with the comprehensive plan's intended use of the site, as it permits residential uses.

However, the comprehensive plan does not detail specific densities that would be appropriate in certain areas. In this case, the context of the properties location and distance from the existing developed portion of the City is important, as there are no other developed areas west of Perche that are similar to the densities generally seen within the City. While there is limited residential development near this site, what is developed is generally rural in nature.

The Walnut Wood Estates subdivision includes large lots that range from 4 acres to over 20 acres, and the property directly to the west of the subject site includes one home on approximately 6 acres. Other County subdivisions along Route UU are similar in nature, and the remaining properties are generally undeveloped (and underdeveloped) parcels that are still larger.

The connectivity provided within the County subdivisions also differs from the objectives of urban-style development. Within Walnut Woods, connectivity is limited, as the site includes one access road serving the entire subdivision, and this is a similar feature of other County subdivisions. This is generally one of the expected contrasts between development within the City and County. The UDC includes subdivision requirements for connectivity between developments to maximize the efficiency of providing services and moving traffic in general within a more urbanized system. If growth is expected to occur in this area, along Gillespie Bridge Road and Route UU, it should be expected to provide the connectivity that is inherently desired in a more urbanized setting.

This site, given its location, may lack the ability to provide connectivity to a wider street network as it is boxed in by Walnut Wood Estates and Perche Creek. The UDC permits only 30 lots to be developed when only one point of access is provided to a through street, which in this case would not permit any further development to the north of the site without providing a second access point, which it currently does not have. Connectivity should be a primary goal of development in this region, and the City should strive to avoid a pattern of development pockets along Gillespie Bridge and Route UU that are not designed with connectivity in mind. Further evaluation of the broader street network could provide guidance for future development and should be considered.

As can be seen with the accompanying preliminary plat, the proposed development of the site is not consistent with the surrounding low-density development pattern. This is not inherently incompatible, as both are residential in nature; however, the desired development pattern on the site depends on the City's desired objectives for its long-term growth. On one hand, if it is considered an appropriate time to encourage development in this area, it is reasonable to permit higher-density development that is dissimilar to adjacent County development. In this scenario, in order to help direct the expected growth, an area land use plan may be beneficial in evaluating the area to determine appropriate land uses and densities, as well as determine the potential infrastructure that would be needed to serve the area, and to allocate the costs associated with the growth, such as road and bridge improvements that could be needed on Gillespie Bridge Road.

On the other hand, if the proposed annexation and development is expected to be an outlier, and limited other development is expected to occur in this area that would seek to connect to City services,

then a lower density may be more appropriate.

Development west of Perche Creek could be patterned after the rural densities and large lots that are already located along Gillespie Bridge Road and Route UU. Currently the only method to require lot sizes larger than 7,000 square feet would be through the use of Planned District (PD) zoning, which would permit restrictions to be placed on the property.

The subject site is not presently contained within the Urban Service Area (USA) as presented in Columbia Imagined. WHY it is not in the Urban Service Area is another question. This does not prevent the annexation of the property as Columbia Imagined lays out possible considerations when analyzing a site that is outside of the USA. Principally, City contributions for CIP projects that would benefit sites should be limited, and impact fees should be considered. At this point, no public investment will be involved in the extension of services to the site – such costs will be borne by the applicant. It is worth noting that the USA was intended to include areas that could be served by City sanitary sewer service, and areas that would be served in the near future due to existing CIP projects that would extend City sewer mains.

The site can currently connect to the sewer main that is located along the Perche Creek with extension of a gravity sewer main approximately 1,500 feet to reach the Overton parcel. In this sense, the site would normally be considered as able to be served by utilities, as would large areas of property west of the Perche Creek that are located in Boone County.

The underlying question on the desired development pattern in this location is if the City desires to expand the City's municipal boundaries west of the Perche Creek, which currently delineates the western limit of more urban/suburban growth. The decision to expand into this area will likely include additional fiscal impacts associated with infrastructure such as roads, as Gillespie Bridge Road is currently an unimproved road that can occasionally flood, and improvements may be needed in the future to upgrade the road to a minor arterial, as it is identified in the Major Roadway Plan (MRP). Currently, no plan or agreement is in place with the applicant to mitigate these potential long-term costs that may be associated with future growth, and they would likely need to be funded by the City through the CIP.

It is also important to note that Columbia Imagined is not a regulatory document, and thus the recommendations provided within it cannot by themselves require compliance. However, the recommendations are used as a tool to identify areas of concern that could be addressed by the applicant or through approval conditions on the annexation, zoning, or platting by Council.

Discussion by the commission ensued. Staff suggested that commission discussion could begin now, that the commission could look at both the subdivision action and the annexation separately and that other actions could be selected by commissioners.

A question was asked regarding how these hearings were publicized and staff indicated that initial hearings were advertised in the newspaper but that not each subsequent tabling or action was publicized in the same fashion. MacMann asked if this site floods. Staff also indicated that part of the second site is within the flood plain. Rushing asked if these are in the flood plain could they get building permits? Staff indicated that the city does permit development within flood plain areas that allow construction that requires any structure be at least one-foot above the flood line, however there is a conflict between the flood plain rules and their application. Staff believes that no portion of a

developable lot be within the floodplain designation. Staff indicated that the Andrews parcel does flood. The exact line of the 100-year flood was not immediately known. Commission asked how long it would take to develop a sub-area plan. Staff indicated that it could take 18-months.

Loe asked if this request can be split into two parts. Staff indicated that they could be considered separately by commission action even though they have the same case number. Staff further indicated that if it is split, then one would be considered as an annexation action and the Overton parcel would be a future annexation agreement. If the Andrews property is rezoned as R-1, then its old agricultural use could be continued as a non-conforming legal use. If this property were regraded, could it be made conforming by building it up to not lie within the flood plain. Loe believes that if part of the property is in the floodway, it cannot be developed. Staff admitted that there are distinctions between floodplain, floodway and flood fringe. Staff indicated that some federal rules do govern development in these various designations in different ways. No floodway development is allowed. Most of this is pertinent to the zoning discussion, not the annexation discussion at this time.

No further questions from commission.

Ground rules for public discussion would be that if there is an organized speaker for the applicant, they should go first. Main speaker would get six minutes. Additional speakers would get 3 minutes. Then we will take up opposing points of view.

An engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant. Indicated that he would reserve most of his comments for the zoning discussion, but that he thought the general staff description was adequate. However, he did indicate that they would be willing to change the zoning request for the Andrews property to A-1 rather than the R-1 requested. We asked for this annexation because we were told to go about this way if we wanted to get city sewer. Also, we do NOT know how long it would take to complete a sub-area plan in this area and would like to move forward on this request, with the change to the R-1 vs A-1 request.

Next speaker indicated that she represented a nearby homeowners' association. Showed pictures of a recent flood event on the Andrews property. Believes that development of this new property could raise flood water levels on nearby properties. Showed a news story from KOMU TV that showed Gillespie Bridge flooding levels. Indicated that if a new subdivision was placed on the wrong side of the flood waters, the homeowners would have to go all the way around to get into town. Also, if the plan is done well, it might be OK. But, if it is more than 30 homes, the impervious surface could create even more flooding.

Next speaker indicated that he remembered the 1993 flood, and that he had property above the floodplain, but it still flooded. Also wanted to know if the sewer lines could accommodate new growth. Does not want to see a new sewer plant in this area since he already smells the current one. Questioned the notification process. Facetiously indicated that they should let it flood, build a gambling boat and generate revenue.

Next speaker indicated that he lived on a family farm in this area and that he has seen the flooding in this area for more than 40 years. Believes it would not be good to develop branches from the main development pattern in this area.

Speaker indicated that she represented Perche Estates. Believes that some other land in this area has already been sold to developers and that it will only make traffic problems worse than they are now. Does not know when the other properties will come online, but that will make things worse. Can't imagine that we just keep building out and ruining quality of life. This makes no sense. Commission asked speaker to describe traffic currently. Speaker indicated that they did a traffic study 10 or 15 years ago and it showed 750 cars per day. Believes that it is difficult to see cars because they can travel 50 miles per hour and curves. If you add a subdivision across the street it will make it worse.

Speaker indicated that when there is an accident on I-70 traffic gets redirected down Gillespie Bridge Road and that we should keep that traffic problem in mind.

Next speaker indicated that he had farm property in this area. It is agriculture in use right now, but the ag on the property barely covers costs. I would like to sell my property and would like a fair price. I think it's OK to do this. I agree we should build in the flood plain, but other than that I am OK.

Next speaker indicated that he thought if there was a low-density subdivision in this area, it would be OK. I can't see my neighbors now, and don't want to see these new ones.

Next speaker was the applicant himself and indicated that the only reason they are here is because they wanted to hook up to the city sewer. The existing line is just 600 feet away. The floods do occur 2 or 3 times a year, but we will do this correctly. Also indicated that people who live immediately around this have expressed interest, support, access. They are immediately adjacent.

No further public comments.

Strodtman assured people that they will have another chance to speak to this issue when it goes to City Council. Also indicated that fire protection agreements are in place, so it is impossible to know exactly how fire service will be provided at this time. Staff indicated that no traffic study was warranted at this location because it was not believed that it would have significant impact.

MacMann indicated that he could not support this project because he believes it does flood more than has been indicated, that it is difficult to provide services to this area and that redirection of traffic from I-70 is a serious consideration. Staff wanted to clarify notification process. Indicated that less than 15 were notified because the large lot sizes mean a lot of people are outside of the required contact area. Staff also indicated that there will be an annexation public hearing on this property on October 16. At that meeting, there will be no discussion of the zoning action, just a first reading. Discussion on the ZONING will take place on November 6. Don't sign up for general public comment, because if the item is on the agenda, they will not be allowed to talk about it at the same meeting.

Loe asked about connectivity and access. Wanted to know about Broadway extension and when any other connections were planned to go to the western side of the city. Staff indicated that it is on the CATSO plan, but no funding is provided and it could be many years. That underlines the need for a sub area transportation plan. If we build out now, it will hasten our need to adopt such a plan. Staff indicated that R-1 style development may be appropriate in this area, but should it be annexed into the city? That is a different question. Also, density and cost allocation may need to be made.

Motion to deny application for annexation on Andrews until it was changed to A-1 (Agreed to by applicant.). Also asked to approve R-1 on the Overton property.

Motion approved 5 to 3. As this goes forward to the City Council, it will not be placed on the Consent Agenda and a hearing will be held on November 6.

Case # 17-171

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of Fred Overton Development, Inc. (owner) for approval of a 38-lot preliminary plat on R-1 (One-family Dwelling) zoned land, to be known as "Perche Ridge", pending the annexation and permanent zoning of the property, with an associated design adjustment to Section 29-5.1(c.3.i.F) regarding loop street length. The 17-acre subject site is generally located on the north side of Gillespie Bridge Road, approximately 3,500 feet west of Louisville Drive.

(Action: Staff indicated that this action only affects 17 acres on the properties discussed earlier. This would establish a preliminary plat for properties, and will impose tree preservation, stormwater rules, connectivity and the avoidance of sensitive areas.

Staff believes that this plan exceeds maximum road length, does not avoid all sensitive areas and only has future additional points of connectivity to the north and west, but those potentials are not shown on this plan. Staff believes that they could also construct two cul de sacs here, but that may not be preferable. We bring this up because there are options that are not shown here. We also need to complete an on-site tree preservation inventory. Staff recommendation is denial, but if it is approved, we approve design adjustment of significant tree inventory.

Loe asked why the staff avoided reporting the adjacent flood plain overlays that could be anticipated. Staff indicated that it would change upon annexation but that until then it is not an existing condition. Rushing asked if there was a creek running through the center of this property? Staff deferred to applicant. Loe indicated that there is a statute for accommodating reductions because of sensitive areas and asked if applicant requested this allowance. Staff indicated that they did not because they did not qualify for that relief.

Public hearing was opened.

Engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant. Indicated that the 300-foot road length was not really a good idea for this area. That rule was designed for other conditions. Showed how they could build a new loop street with two entrances on a street with two access points.

Sensitive area avoidance was addressed by the engineer. He pointed out that development could not occur except under specific conditions. If you follow this policy the way the staff interpreted it, you couldn't put a trail, a park a shelter, a building – nothing. We are proposing safeguards. We won't build in the floodway – but we may increase the elevation of property in the floodplain. We are bound by federal rules administered by the city. We can comply and will not encroach on floodway. We are also working on getting 22 acres of park and city is looking for a trail connection in this area that we could provide.

Commissioner asked why not just move all the development to higher ground? Engineer indicated that there was a financial consideration regarding sewer extension and how many units could be served. Commissioner asked about water flow across the property. Engineer indicated that there is sheet flow but no concentrated place of water. Indicated that some detention areas are in the floodplain and that

that could be acceptable. Also indicated that the responsibility to make individual lots compatible with floodplain rules would be the responsibility of individual lot owners.

Stanton challenged that concept that filling in low areas would work because he has built structures in New Orleans and it got washed away. He wants to move the development to higher ground. Engineer indicated that base flood information from FEMA is not 100%, but that they are engineers and will work with this data.

Next speaker asked if there is a requirement to build even if this is approved? Staff indicated that a preliminary plat will expire after five years. Lots cannot be sold until final plats are filed. Infrastructure would need to be extended before you can get an occupancy permit. Speaker believed that we should establish a line of demarcation. There are some problems with this and it will not fit in with everything else around it.

Next speaker asked if we get to the point where homes are built in this flood plain area, can they get insurance. Commissioner indicated that if the properties are raised above the flood level, they don't need insurance. Speaker indicated that in Houston people who got flooded did not all have insurance. Commission indicated that you cannot protect against all floods, but you can build in reasonable ways. Speaker admitted that she did not ever get flooded, but that some houses that already exist have flooded. So, what happens when you buy a new home and they don't have insurance. FEMA drives this process. They try to protect people but they can't protect all. Why not buy lots up the hill on this neighbor's property?

MacMann indicated that the FEMA process makes you comply with safe conditions and that banks will not loan on unprotected land and that fill is not always the best option.

The applicant indicated that his lots will be two feet above the 100-year flood plain and that his engineer will certify that in the places where it is true.

Next speaker indicated that he lived in this same area in 1993. They marked the water on the bridge then and it was two thirds over the bridge, but never touched the Overton land and that was a 500-year plan.

Public hearing was closed.

Stanton indicated that he was a capitalist, but understood the forces of mother nature. He thinks something is possible here, but this is not the right plan. He just wants it to work safely. Look at your margins differently. Move the project further west. I don't have money on the table. But, I don't like it.

Toohy indicated that he will support this. Indicated on the back side of Vanderveen they have had no flooding. Thinks it is better to tie into city sewer than not. Will support.

Loe thinks the engineer has correctly identified FEMA standards, but believes that those are minimum standards and that our local standards and floodplain overlay is not being met by this proposal.

Rushing follows Mr. Stanton's comments and sees waterways crossing this property. She believes that it will cause environmental degradation and a lot more impermeable surface. Burns will not support.

MacMann made a motion to DENY this application. Seconded by Rushing.

Motion to DENY approved 5 to 3. This item will go to the City Council but with a negative recommendation.)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

(None.)

STAFF COMMENTS

Staff indicated that next meeting will be October 5. McGary and Middle School subdivisions will be considered as well as Lewis (at Old Plank Road) and Gadbois (on Nifong) projects.

In addition, there will be comments relating to rules of procedure for the Planning & Zoning Commission.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

(None.)

NEXT MEETING DATE - October 5, 2017 @ 7 pm

ADJOURNMENT

(Time: Approximately 10:17 PM)

© 2017 CityWatch-Columbia

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