



Columbia Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Recap

Council Chambers, Columbia City Hall
7:00 PM Thursday, September 20, 2018

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Agenda approved as submitted.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES [August 23, 2018](#)
[September 6, 2018](#)

(Both sets of minutes were approved without amendment.)

TABLING REQUESTS

Case #18-166

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Gary Ridenhour (owner), to have 64.32 acres permanently zoned R-1 (One-family Dwelling), 2.29 acres permanently zoned M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood), and 2.38 acres permanently zoned M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor) subject to annexation into the City of Columbia. The subject site contains a total of 68.98 acres and is presently zoned County A-2 (Agriculture). The site is generally located east of Masonic Drive, west of Alfalfa Drive & Oakland Gravel Road, and north of Prathersville Road.

(Action: Staff explained that the applicant has asked for 3 different zoning classifications for a large tract of land. This request allows time for a development agreement to be crafted. Staff and the applicant have met, but that document is not complete. Staff supports the request. It is anticipated that this could come back to the commission at the first meeting in October. The Chair indicated that arguments about the zoning should not be heard tonight, but that arguments regarding tabling could be considered.

Public comment was opened.

An engineer on behalf of the applicant appeared and stated that he could answer questions and that the applicant and neighbors have been engaged in discussions.

The next speaker stated that she lives on a farm that abuts the property. She is concerned about the tabling. She wants to see the new plan moving forward, but is not comfortable at this point.

The request to table until October 4 was considered and granted by unanimous vote of the members present.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 18-173

A request by Lueck Surveying (agent), on behalf of Melissa M. Williams (owner), to rezone 0.2 acres from R-1 (One-family Residential) to M-OF (Mixed-use Office). The subject property is located on the south side of Heriford Road southeast of the terminus of Burlington Street and addressed as 1804 Heriford Road.

(Action: Staff presented a report. Advertising for this action occurred as required. The applicant is seeking to rezone her property from R-1 to M-OF in order to permit the property to be used for a marriage and family counseling services office. The owner is a licensed counselor and intends to conduct sessions within the existing single-family home structure. The applicant is not proposing any redevelopment of the property only minor interior modifications to the home. The UDC does permit home occupations; however, requires that the home be the primary residence for the person conducting business within the home. Ms. Williams will not reside in the home; therefore, the requested rezoning is required to permit the intended use on the property.

The M-OF district serves as a transition from the residential lots east of the subject site, to the commercial properties further west along Heriford Road. The lot immediately west of the subject site is split-zoned R-1 and M-C (Mixed-Use Commercial). The R-1 portion of this lot has been utilized for stormwater detention for the Columbia Honda car dealership. This makes it unlikely that a single-family home will ever be rebuilt west of the subject property.

Office uses are considered transitional in nature because they serve as a low-intensity buffer between residential and commercial uses. Office uses would typically be limited in hours of operation and daily vehicle trips are considered to be minimal. The subject property is part of an original 1956 14-lot residential development that has become surrounded by more intrusive commercial and industrial uses. Of the original 14-lots only 6 (including the subject site) remain used for single-family purposes. Columbia Imagined designates the subject property and adjacent R-1 lots as part of the Neighborhood District. This designation was applied based upon its existing use as residential at the time the Plan was adopted. The surrounding parcels; however, are designated Employment District (to the east) and Commercial District (to the west) and are improved to accommodate uses consistent with those designations. The isolation of the existing residential parcels and recent improvements within the surrounding area, primarily to the west, suggests that development patterns will eventually exclude residential uses from the area at some point in the future.

The Neighborhood District does permit non-residential uses that would support services to neighborhood residents. While the proposed conversion of the existing single-family home from residential to office occupancy to support individuals outside the neighborhood is inconsistent with the general description of the District, it is staff's belief that the request is reasonable given the surrounding land use context. Furthermore, the appearance of the neighborhood will be minimally impacted by the rezoning given the proposed home will not be altered from the exterior. The proposal has been reviewed by staff and meets all applicable City zoning standards. The existing utilities to which the lot would connect have available capacity. The requested M-OF zoning is supported by staff and believed to be consistent with adjacent zoning and development patterns.

Staff recommendation is to approve the request to rezone the property M-OF (Mixed-Use Office).

Loe asked if there were any public comments returned. Staff indicated that there were two phone calls requesting information, but no objections. MacMann asked about redevelopment of the property. Staff indicated that it could not be redeveloped unless the entire property were to be changed. The remnant lots would need to be combined for development.

Strodtman asked about parking. Staff indicated that at least two spots would be available onsite, but not much more. He also asked about lighting on this parcel. Staff indicated that if additional lighting were to be introduced, it would be limited, but there is no mandate for security lighting. In terms of signage, the property would be allowed to have a ten-foot-tall sign, at least ten feet off the public right-of-way, with a maximum of 48 square feet. If the use changed in the future, the signage would require a separate application and approval. Wall signs would be allowed. The chair thought there should be some protections for the existing neighbors even though it appears it will change over time. He thought some business might want to advertise with a big sign toward I-70.

MacMann asked about future expansion. Staff indicated that if it went office, it would intentionally be required to set back even further. The building could be 35 feet tall, or else it would have to increase the setback, which would then further limit the size of the building. Staff believed that this will not be redeveloped on a significant scale due to limitations. MacMann does not want to drive existing neighbors out.

Public hearing was opened.

A surveyor appeared on behalf of the applicant. He agreed with the staff report and indicated that the existing single-family homes are actually rental properties. She is only requesting small signage and no additional exterior lighting. Office hours end at 6:00 PM. The driveway will accommodate parking for two cars. No weekend hours are contemplated at this time.

The public hearing was closed.

A motion to approve was made and passed unanimously, 8-0.)

Case # 18-175

A request by Simon & Struempff Engineering (agent), on behalf of MBS Realty Partners, LP (owners), requesting a major amendment to the existing "MBS O-P Plan" and approval of a new PD Plan to be known as "Boone County Family Resources PD Plan". The applicant is also seeking design exceptions from Section 29-4.4(f) and Section 29-4.6(c)(1) of the UDC pertaining to parking lot landscaping and entry door placement, respectively. The 2.44-acre site is located on the south side of West Ash Street between Heather Lane and Fairview Road and is addressed as 2700 West Ash Street.

(Action: Staff indicated that appropriate notice was provided. The applicant is seeking a major amendment to the existing MBS OP Plan to facilitate the sale of the subject property to Boone County Family Resources (BCFR). The proposed building, once constructed, will house their administrative office functions. The sale contract for the property is contingent on the approval of this amendment which will reconfigure the property to fit BCFR's needs. The original O-P plan, approved in 2015, was designed to offer supplemental office space for MBS operations on the north side of Ash Street.

The proposed plan would increase the gross floor area of the building from 27,000 square feet to 37,000 square feet. What has happened is that the new proposal uses up all the allowable impervious surface allowed within this plan. The proposed building will be two stories with a basement walkout on the west side and be no greater than 50-feet tall. This increase in building size is necessary to meet the current

spatial needs of BCFR and would allow space for continued growth of the organization. Parking is to be increased in order to offset the additional building area, from 129 total spaces to 156 spaces. As a result of the plan changes, stormwater detention must be relocated from an at-grade location, as shown on the original plan, to an underground storage facility. All other design parameters are to be compliant with the original statement of intent for the “MBS O-P Plan.”

The applicant is seeking exceptions from the provisions of Section 29-4.4(f) [Parking Lot Landscaping] and Section 29-4.6(c)(1) [Entries] of the UDC, respectively. Section 29-4.4(f) of the UDC requires any parking areas containing more than 100 spaces to include interior landscaping equivalent to ten percent (10%) of the paved area. Interior landscaped areas used to meet the 10% requirement must be at least ten (10) feet wide and shall be graded below the elevation of the paved area to accept stormwater runoff. The applicant is proposing a 6-foot wide landscape strip in lieu of the required 10-foot strip and is proposing to maintain 2,400 square feet of interior parking lot landscaping in lieu of the required 5,222 square feet.

The existing MBS O-P Plan was proposed with 129 parking spaces which were less than the 150-space requirement that would have triggered the need for a 10-foot wide landscape island per former Chapter 29. Furthermore, former Chapter 29 did not include provisions mandating a percentage of interior parking lot landscaping after exceeding a parking space threshold. The applicant is proposing 156 parking spaces resulting in the need to install the landscape strip and additional interior parking lot landscaping. The code required number of parking spaces, less 12 bicycle spaces, needed to accommodate the 37,000 square foot office building is 111 spaces. The additional 45 parking spaces, according to the applicant, are proposed to support the long-term parking needs of BCFR as they grow into the entire building. Additionally, the applicant indicates that the reduced width of the landscape island is being proposed to maintain grade transitions. It should be noted that the parking space dimensions shown on the plan are 8.5' x 18.5' which is greater than the required 8.5' x 18' of the UDC. A reduction in the parking space size would bring the parking lot into greater UDC compliance by enlarging the width of the landscape island which in turn would result in greater interior parking lot landscaping. Right now, they can do a 6-foot green strip. By reducing parking, they can get to 8. That is up to the commission.

Section 29-4.6(c)(1) requires that a principal building shall have one or more operating entry doors facing and visible from the adjacent public street. The MBS O-P plan was approved with the building and its entrance facing east, toward the parking lot instead of facing Ash Street. The applicant wishes to maintain this orientation due to the constraints of the long, narrow property. The bulk of site users will travel to the building via car and enter from the parking lot. There used to be a bus stop here, but the bus route does not match that at this point. That could be eliminated.

Access will be provided from the existing sidewalk and bus stop to the east-facing entrance. While the entrance orientation is inconsistent with the strict application of the UDC's provisions, the entrance is nonetheless visible from Ash Street and will be a focal point along the building's eastern façade given its location under a covered canopy.

Staff mentioned that there is a 45-foot height restriction, but because of grading they could use an additional 5-foot variance in terms of height.

Staff is recommending acceptance of the proposal with a slight modification which as described as:
Approve the major PD Plan amendment subject to:

1. Reducing the size of the proposed parking spaces to 8.5' x 18' and increasing the width of the parking lot island to increase overall interior parking lot landscaping.
2. Granting the design exception to Section 29-4.6(c)(1)

Rushing asked if there are tree preservation requirements? Staff indicated that the same requirements will apply, even though the new building will build up to the old area. Loe asked about a 5-foot height increase from 45 feet to possibly 50. Staff explained that that was not asked for as an amendment, but that some grading issues based on the way it is measured may require some grace. MacMann asked if the structure is two stories or three? Staff indicated it is two stories with a walkout.

The chair asked about parking stall length. Staff indicated that you could save some space on the parking spaces and could be returned to additional landscape strips in the center of the project.

The hearing was opened.

An agent of the applicant appeared and offered to answer questions. He then indicated that he has letters of support from primary surrounding property owners. The speaker indicated that old codes made this a little challenging because the new rules treat the parking, the fall of the site, detention, tree preservation and building heights. We are really asking for an increase in parking. Their current site has 95 spots. We think the new facility will need at least 150 stalls, with 142 employees and needs for clients. We support the change in the size of the parking stalls. This is a good compromise. From a civil engineering point of view, we have a lot of fall. We want less than 10 feet. We are at about 14. We have asked for a little grace and variance in this regard.

MacMann asked about the bioretention facility adjacent to the site. The speaker indicated that they will retain the stormwater on site and detain that water. It is not really bioretention, it is a little more expensive solution. MacMann asked about an increase in building height. The speaker indicated that he thought they would be under 45 feet, but some building edges might exceed the technical new definition, so they want a little grace. Loe asked about the height from the parking lot. The speaker indicated that it will be two stories of about 12 to 13 feet per story.

The next speaker is the ED of the end user. She explained the function of the Boone County Resource Center and described how they help the community. We have been growing. We need more space as our services have expanded. We need more parking. We do have a community room that will mainly allow us to have employee meetings, but we need more customer parking as well. Broadway Christian Church, our neighbor, is supportive of this project. We work with them on many levels including community gardens.

MacMann asked what they would do with the old property. They do not know about that at this time. He then indicated that he was a neighbor of their current facility.

The chair asked if most of their services were outbound or inbound. The speaker indicated that they do a lot of off-site work but do have a lot of inbound traffic.

The hearing was closed.

MacMann asked for clarification regarding design exemptions, including 4 specific exemptions and some best practice suggestions from staff. Are we prepared to vote on this and how should the motion be stated?

MacMann indicated that he would like to make a motion. He withdrew his motion. Russell substituted a motion to approve design exceptions, parking changes, a five-foot height extension on the building and acceptance of the new plan as generally presented by staff. It was seconded by Stanton.

The commission approved the motion as made unanimously, 8 – 0.)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

(None.)

STAFF COMMENTS

The next meeting will be held on October 4 with a number of items up for consideration. The items scheduled are as follows:

- Subdivision modification for Victory Church on a sidewalk along Ballenger road. There will be some issues regarding sidewalks and pedways.
- Discovery Park South which has been tabled previously
- Cullimore Cottages – a city project that will be a cottage project and a Planned Zoning request.
- University Chrysler Subaru – Screening buffer and modification of a Planned Zoning with new landscaping instead of fencing. **Apparently, there is some long-standing controversy on this item.**
- Ridenour Permanent zoning that was tabled tonight.
- Oakland Crossing project in the same general area.

The next work session will deal with the Scenic Overlay on Rock Quarry Road and **we will also talk about vacation rental/short term rental standards.**

COMMISSION COMMENTS

(Strodtman indicated that both he and Mr. Stanton will be absent at the next meeting.)

NEXT MEETING DATE - October 4, 2018 @ 7 pm

ADJOURNMENT

(Time: 8:12 PM)

© 2018 CityWatch-Columbia

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