



Columbia Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Recap

Council Chambers, Columbia City Hall
7:00 PM Thursday, September 19, 2019

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

APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Additions to the agenda including the withdrawal of Case #180-2019. It may be resubmitted at a later date. The amended agenda was approved and that case will not be heard tonight.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES ([September 5, 2019](#) meeting minutes approved as submitted.)

SUBDIVISIONS

Case # 180-2019

A request by Engineering Surveys & Services (agent) on behalf of JDM II SF National LLC (owner) for a three-lot preliminary plat of 102.85 acres of property located southeast of the intersection of Southampton Drive and Providence Road (State Route 163). The property is zoned M-OF (Mixed Use- Office) and is addressed 4700 S. Providence Road

(This item was tabled at the September 5, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting).

(This item was withdrawn from consideration.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND SUBDIVISIONS

(The following three cases are related, but require separate votes.)

Case # 194-2019

A request by Van Matre Law Firm (agent), on behalf of the Donna Jean Armstrong Unitrust (owner), for approval to rezone 6.8 acres of property currently within the City from A (Agricultural) to M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood). The subject site is located on the south side of Clark Lane, approximately 1,200 feet west of St. Charles Road, and addressed as 5320 Clark Lane.

(Action: The applicant is seeking a zoning map amendment (also known as a rezoning) in order to rezone the subject property from A to MN, which would permit a mix of commercial and other uses. Property to the west is zoned PD and allows residential density of 8 units per acre, and to the east is zoned M-C on the southern portion, and County C-G on the northern portion. Clark Lane borders the property on the north, with R-2 zoning on the north side of Clark Lane. The site is bordered on the south by Interstate 70. The subject property is currently vacant.

In addition to the requested rezoning, a permanent zoning for the site to the east (Case #195-2019) to zone it M-C and M-N upon annexation, and a preliminary plat (case #196-2019) that includes both the subject property and the adjacent property proposed to be annexed has been submitted together for consideration.

In the case of the first rezoning request, the site, while identified as Neighborhood, is located right on the boundary between the Neighborhood and Commercial Districts. While the boundaries of these districts are subjective and are conceptual in nature, the intersection node of I-70 and St. Charles clearly represents a type of commercial district. Given this location, a wide variety of uses could be considered, such as low intensity commercial uses, office, and high-density residential. The appropriate zoning for this site could include M-N, but it may also include M-OF or R-MF, which would provide uses that are appropriate in the transition between Neighborhood and Commercial, but not commercial uses. Per Columbia Imagined, M-N may be appropriate within a "Neighborhood District" to provide services to residents, and the site abuts property that is currently residentially zoned, and is in use as residential. The M-N district also limits many uses (or allows them as conditional uses) that would not be compatible next to residential property as well as permits multi-family dwellings, providing opportunities for increased residential density.

Given the abundance of vacant commercially-zoned land, adding the subject acreage to the existing conditions may further dilute development potential within the area. The commercial district to which the subject site is proposed to be added contains approximately 150 acres of which half is currently vacant. What isn't well represented in the area is property zoned for high density residential (up to 17 units per acre) uses, which could provide dwelling units and residents to support the commercial district as discussed in Columbia Imagined.

While the M-N district permits residential dwellings, often times the zoning of a property dictates how the site will be developed given the expectation of a certain return on investment for commercially zoned property. This site is not altogether unsuited for commercial zoning; to the contrary, it is within the radius of the commercial node and is adjacent to an arterial street that has undergone upgrades to support more intense development. The area includes nearly 150 acres of property currently zoned to allow some type of commercial uses of which less than half currently has a structure on it. The elevation of this site does create some sort of definition between properties, and there are some surrounding properties that have commercial entitlement attached to this property.

The applicant has not indicated that development of the subject acreage is imminent. If the site had been identified with a specific development such information could have been used to provide justification that there was enough demand to consider the site for a commercial rezoning. Staff noted that there was not plan, but they were not pursuing Planned zoning. The staff recommendation understands that the report does not say that the requested use is inappropriate. Without such indication and given the abundance of existing vacant commercially-zoned land the request to rezone the subject site appears premature.

The most appropriate zoning for this site in terms of the City's goals could include M-N, but it may also include M-OF or R-MF. A conservative approach would be to leave the zoning as it currently is A (Agriculture) while the commercial node further develops.

This accomplishes two things - it prevents the increase of additional vacant commercially-zoned and land and further dilution of opportunities to absorb existing vacant commercial property while there is

limited demand. Put another way, limiting the increase in supply of commercial zoning allows for development to catch up with the existing supply that is already zoned and ready for development.

Second, it allows the market to better determine what the need is at this location once the commercial district is further developed. While additional commercial zoning may still be needed, it may be determined that commercial zoning at other commercial nodes (e.g. near Battle High School) is desired, and that those commercial nodes should have an opportunity to provide the commercial property supply to develop uses to serve those surrounding residents. If so, the adjacent commercial district may be best served by zoning this site to allow high-density residential development, which would provide nearby, walkable access for residents with a density up to 17 dwelling units per acre directly adjacent to a commercial district, with an existing pedway providing walking and biking access.

Taking all of this into account, the staff recommends denial of the request.

MacMann indicated that he had spoken to a representative of the applicant prior to this meeting. MacMann asked if surrounding properties were being utilized as multi-family housing. Staff indicated that was true. MacMann asked what buffers would be required. Staff indicated that there would be some regular setbacks, some Neighborhood Protection setbacks and other regulations. MacMann asked about the solar farm property and staff indicated that after that there had been some additional requests for rezoning. MacMann asked if there was a need for housing in this area. Staff said they could not answer that question with certainty. Another staff member indicated that this property could request rezoning in the future if it could be shown that a need exists.

Strodtman asked what the ratio is that the staff used to determine what is appropriate and what should be approved. Is it 20%? Is it our decision to determine whether or not this will be successful? What is the threshold? Staff said there is no hard number, minimum or limit. Staff said that the commercial vacancy is high, or maybe that the commercial development has not caught up with the surrounding residential development. Staff said they thought that was within their realm to talk about that and that it should be considered. Staff also said that they thought they should bring up the idea of walkability. Strodtman asked if we have a hard and fast rule. Otherwise, he thinks that a neighborhood could come up, think it won't be successful, and then put pressure on the city to deny. Strodtman thought this was vague and that the city was trying to dictate a business decision that they are not qualified to make. Unless we have a process, like 75% occupied or something, we should not go down this road.

Rushing agreed and thought that the M-N zoning was appropriate. She thought that limiting this base on staff predictions was inappropriate. Toohey said he thought that there is not a clear indication that additional commercial was not appropriate. Staff said that the rezoning could create a different dynamic in this area and that approval could change the dynamic and could dilute commercial viability. Staff said that if we had rooftops and demand, then we may have also seen a different dynamic. You are pulling away the development from another property. That is our position. It may not be wise on our end, but there are different levels of demand in this community and some have been idle for years. Is this an appropriate use? That was part of our decision. We understand that this is a directional shift, but we need to make that case. Russell said that this was holding the applicant hostage and thought that was inappropriate to make someone prove a future use in order to get appropriate zoning.

Loe asked if it was true that M-N would allow multi-family residential. Staff said that was allowed. So, if this was rezoned M-N, it could still be used that way. Loe then brought up another case that is related. She noted that originally the applicant asked for all M-N. They changed the request to up some part to

M-C if they would not pursue this part. Is that right? Staff said that the original request was to get some M-C and some M-N. The staff report shows that there were two ways to pursue this, but there was no different original proposal or contingency. We do not allow for an applicant to apply with a contingency.

MacMann thought that right now it would be good to hear from the applicant. He thought that if there were going to be some test in terms of ratios and intensities, we need to establish that before we hold someone to such a standard. Staff said that they agree that there is one part of this that would be commercially appropriate, but that this one part might not be appropriate for commercial development.

The public hearing was opened.

An attorney for the applicant appeared. He noted that other engineering representatives were present and could answer questions. The speaker took a different look at existing conditions relating to zoning. He said that staff said this could be a catalytic project, but if you look at existing uses it should be considered to be appropriate. If you look at the M-N ordinance, what we are proposing looks just like what is defined in the current code. If you look at the current use, it does not achieve the city's goal. Is this commission in the business of making decisions based on market conditions? I will leave that to you. If you look to the catalytic impacts of this decision, look to the east. It is commercial. And, if that was not built out that way, residential would be allowed under the requested zoning. The speaker showed pictures of existing buffers. Even if this was developed, it would not eliminate the buffer shown in the presentation. We agree with much of what is in the staff report, but we do disagree with the recommendation. We ask for the requested rezoning.

There were no other speakers on this case.

**A motion to approve this request was made and a vote was called.
The motion was approved 7 to 1 with Carroll voting NO despite the negative staff recommendation.)**

Case # 195-2019

A request by Van Matre Law Firm (agent), on behalf of the Donna Jean Armstrong Unitrust (owner), to permanently zone 18.06 acres from County C-G (General Commercial) to 15.37 acres of City M-C (Mixed Used-Corridor) and 2.69 acres of City M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood), upon annexation. The subject site is located at the southwest corner of Clark Lane and St. Charles Road, and includes property addressed 5406 Clark Lane.

(Action: The applicant is seeking approval of a combination of M-C (15.37 ac) and M-N (2.69 ac) zoning as permanent zoning on approximately 18.06 acres of property located at the southwest corner of St. Charles Road and Clark Lane pending approval of its annexation into the City of Columbia by City Council. The site is currently located within unincorporated Boone County and zoned C-G (General Commercial) which is similar to the City's M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor) district.

The property to the west of the subject site is zoned City A (Agriculture) and is currently vacant. Clark Lane borders the property on its north. Property to the north of Clark Lane is zoned County C-GP (Planned Commercial) and R-M (Moderate Density Residential) and improved with a multi-tenant commercial building and dwellings. St. Charles Road borders the site on the east with M-C zoning on the opposite side of the street improved with a mix of commercial businesses that include a fast food restaurant and a multi-tenant commercial building. The site is bordered on the south by additional M-C zoned property that includes a funeral home. The subject property is generally vacant with the exception of a single-family structure on its western boundary in the area proposed to be zoned M-N.

The site is contiguous with the City's existing municipal boundary along its entire south, east and west property lines and is served by City of Columbia sewer and water and Boone Electric Cooperative electric facilities.

The location of the proposed M-C and M-N zoning appears to be compatible with the surrounding uses. Per Columbia Imagined, "Commercial Districts" contains a variety of citywide and regional retail uses as well as offices, businesses, personal services, and high-density multi-family dwellings as supporting uses within the district. The site, while identified as a Commercial District, does NOT currently fit all the hallmarks of a Commercial District as defined in Columbia Imagined, specifically an area that provides regional retail uses, with retail businesses exceeding 40,000 square feet (although there may be enough property to accommodate that scale of development on the south side of I-70). The site; however, does include enough of the characteristics to generally consider it a Commercial District that is perhaps similar to a Neighborhood Marketplace, which is designed to serve more of the local needs than those of the region. It is worth noting that the East Area Plan, which applies to the commercial property south of I70, states that the commercial area in that vicinity should focus more on local commercial needs, not regional as would be expected for a commercial district. It is probably accurate to consider this commercial node somewhat of a hybrid between a commercial district and a neighborhood marketplace (which is not an uncommon occurrence, as most districts do not fit neatly inside a box).

The specific property is clearly suited for commercial uses as it is located at the intersection of two arterial streets with nearby access to Interstate 70. It is also worth noting that the site is currently zoned CG (General Commercial) in the County, which is considered similar to the City's M-C zoning. Transitioning to M-N zoning on the west side of the site is appropriate to lower the intensity of commercial uses while moving further from the major intersection and closer to the boundary of the commercial district.

It should be noted that there are residential uses located to the north of this site across Clark Lane which is an arterial street. Arterial streets are viewed as an appropriate transition point between commercial and residential uses given the significant physical boundary that they create. The presence of this type of improvement between the subject site and the adjacent uses should be considered when evaluating if the requested zoning is appropriate. Staff believes that the roadway provides an adequate buffer from the impacts that may be generated, and it should be further noted that pursuant to the UDC street trees and potentially parking lot screening will required as part of future development plan approvals.

Staff recommends approval.

A motion to approve was made and passed unanimously without significant discussion.)

Case # 196-2019

A request by Van Matre Law Firm (agent), on behalf of the Donna Jean Armstrong Unitrust (owner) for approval of a six-lot preliminary plat on property proposed to be zoned M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood) and M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor) and to be known as "Columbia Corners", pending annexation and permanent zoning. The 25.38-acre subject site is located at the southwest corner of Clark Lane and St. Charles Road.

(Action: The applicant is seeking approval of a 6-lot preliminary plat on approximately 25 acres. The site is proposed to be zoned upon annexation to M-C, with the exception of the east portion of Lot 6 which is proposed to be zoned M-N per case #195-2019. **The west portion of Lot #6 is associated with Case #194-2019 which was earlier approved.**

The site is currently mostly vacant, the exception of a single-family house on the west side of the site. There is also a gravel parking lot in the southeast corner of the site near the St. Charles Road roadway frontage. A pond is located near the center of the property as well. The plat proposes a lot layout that will include an arrangement of potential anchor lots along with out lots. Lot 6, approximately 6 acres, will have direct frontage along Clark Lane, with the smaller Lot 5 to its east having frontage on both Clark Lane and St. Charles Road.

Access to the site will be primarily from the two abutting arterial streets - Clark Lane on the north and St. Charles to the east. Clark Lane is an improved street with approximately 50 feet of pavement that includes two traffic lanes, a turn lane, and bike lanes. St. Charles Road is partially improved, with pavement widths that vary from approximately 38 feet to 54 feet in width. The intersection of the two streets is also improved with a roundabout. No internal public streets are planned for this site. Additional right of way for St. Charles Road will be dedicated at the time of final platting to provide the required 50-foot half-width as well as right of way at the northeast corner of the site to accommodate an additional lane near the roundabout. This additional lane was identified as part of the required traffic impact analysis to address the potential increased traffic generation in the area as a whole as the City continues to grow.

Staff SUPPORTS approval of the preliminary plat for Columbia Corners in light of the earlier action of the commission on Case #194-2019.

Public comment was opened and an engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant. He offered to answer any questions. None were forthcoming.

**The public comment period was closed and a motion to approve was made.
The motion to approve the preliminary plat was approved unanimously.)**

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 199-2019

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of AMW Investment Properties, LLC (owner) to revise the existing, "Sidra Subdivision PD Plan," to permit the construction of a carport structure over existing parking spaces, the installation of solar panels on top of and adjacent to the carport structure, and the construction of a small equipment shed near the west end of the residential structures to house components of the solar system. The subject site is located at 2002 Rashid Court, and contains 0.86 acres.

(Action: The Sidra Subdivision PD Plan was approved by Council in September 2017. The applicant is seeking to revise the approved PD plan to permit construction of a carport over a portion of the parking area, a retaining wall along the northern edge of the property, and a rooftop and ground-mounted solar array located to the south of the parking area. The proposed changes to the plan impact private infrastructure with the addition of solar, and the ground-mounted array and utility shed will negate a portion of the site's open space, thus a major PD amendment is required.)

While undertaking detailed site engineering, the applicants determined that a retaining wall is necessary across the north property boundary to address grading concerns across the site, and to permit usable outdoor space for residents of the development. Landscaping and screening in this location will not be impacted. Additionally, the vertical separation created by the wall will further help with buffering and

delineation between the subject site and the properties to the north and west. The proposed carport structure offers covered parking for up to seven vehicles, and would allow for roughly 800 square feet of roof-mounted solar panels. Another 800 square feet of ground-mounted solar panels are delineated just south of the carport, on an open lawn area. With the addition of solar panels, the need arose for a utility shed on the property, which has been located just west of the residential structure on the plan. The shed will house required cutoffs and panels for the solar arrays, as well as other solar-related equipment. In this location the retaining wall and screening device will screen the shed from neighboring properties to the west.

Staff considers the proposed amendments to be reasonable. The applicants have indicated a market demand for additional amenities, such as the covered parking and solar electricity. The proposed retaining wall is responsive to site topography and provides greater separation between the site and neighboring properties.

Staff noted that this request does not conflict with the original intent, but it is a request that needs approval.

MacMann asked if the property owners to the north were not in favor of this? Staff noted that there was one comment from a resident who worried about aesthetics and impervious surface. Rushing asked about the retaining wall. Staff noted that it is not adjacent to the parking. Staff indicated that the solar panels would not require any additional screening other than what is specified in the code.

A public comment period was opened.

An engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant. He noted that two years ago there was some discussion about this site and that the new retaining wall actually limits some of the traffic noted two years ago. He indicated that the additional solar panels could not all be accommodated on the roof of the parking garage, and that each living unit will be allocated the use of the solar panels.

MacMann asked if the carport will have gutters? The engineer indicated that it will have gutters. Rushing asked if any other landscaping would be contemplated. The engineer indicated that there will be some additional street landscaping and some around the new structures. Loe asked about the aesthetics of the new building. Will this be screened in terms of sight lines? The engineer said the building will be more modern than what some people are used to. Loe asked if these solar panels will be visible since the site is a little more raised? Rushing was concerned about the visibility of the project. Loe said she thought the solar panels might be more attractive than the original raw structure. Toohey asked if this was part of the original plan? The speaker said no, this was a new idea.

There was no further discussion on this item.

A motion to approve was made.

The item was approved 7 -1 with Rushing voting NO.)

Case # 200-2019

A request by A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of Kanko, LLC (owner), for a rezoning of parts of Lot 1005 and 1006 of Oak Forest Plat 10 (except for that part of Lot 1006 deeded to the City of Columbia) from PD (Planned Development) to M-C (Mixed use- Corridor). The approximate 4.08-acre property is located

generally north of the intersection of E. Green Meadows Road and Gray Oak Drive and is addressed 955 E. Green Meadows Road.

(Action: The staff presented a preliminary report, but noted that they had received questions from the Sierra Club and area residents since the publication of the existing staff report. The Sierra Club correspondence cited impacts to an area stream. The full report continued.

The applicant is seeking to rezone approximately 4 acres of property from PD (Planned Development) to M-C (Mixed use- Corridor). The site's existing PD zoning was originally approved on October 6, 2003 (Ord. #17858) and designated the property PUD (Planned Unit Development) and C-P (Planned Commercial District).

In terms of uses, the original 2003 rezoning allowed all R-3 (now analogous to R-MF) uses in Tract B and all C-1 (now analogous to the M-N) plus C-P uses in Tract A. The applicant did not choose to add any permitted C-3 uses (analogous to M-C); however, it should be noted that several of the permitted uses are presently permitted in the current M-C zoning district. Of the C-P uses possible in 2003, amusement parks, commercial stables, movie theaters, bowling alleys, farm machinery sales and service, gun clubs, halfway houses, machine shops, and plumbing/heating/and air conditioning and electrical businesses were explicitly excluded. Following these exclusions commercial baseball/athletic fields, racetracks, fairgrounds, commercial picnic grounds and fishing lakes, drive-in theaters, and outdoor stage and concert facilities remained as permissible uses of Tract A. The 2007 approved Oak Forest C-P Plan permitted a two-story (up to 45-foot tall) 32,800 square foot building on this site. The building was proposed to have retail on the first floor and office on the second floor with 140 parking spaces provided in a front and rear parking lot (137 spaces were required for the proposed use mix per the 2007 parking requirements. If this plan were to be built today there would be no more than 140 spaces built; however, the number would likely be less due to revised parking requirements of the UDC). The plan further indicated that 56% of the site was proposed to remain natural or in landscaping.

Staff noted that if the request were to be granted, it would change the calculation on the existing plan in terms of residential density, but that new density would still be allowed under the plan. Also, if you take this requested property out of the original site, all items would still qualify, but in Lot A there would still be restrictions on the use of the area under a Planned zoning designation. The request is to not exclude any old C-3 uses. However, some uses in the new request under the new code would be restricted since they were not included in the new code.

The subject site is surrounded by M-OF (Mixed use- Office) across Green Meadows Road to the southwest, M-N directly across Green Meadows Road to the south, and PD zoning to the east, north and west. There is a large swath of A (Agriculture) zoned property to the northeast of the site extending to Rock Quarry Road. The PD zoned property around the site is generally developed to the extent possible, with the aforementioned Oak Forest PUD, to the west and north, in accordance to the plan (minus the 18 duplex units shown on the plan). Additionally, the vacant property to the immediate north of the site in the Oak Forest PUD Plan is subject to a drainage easement owned by the City. The property to the east of the subject site includes a three-acre tree preservation area for the Grindstone Plaza development, as well as sanitary sewer and utility easements limiting potential development. M-C zoning is located nearby, within the Red Oak Plaza roughly 500 feet away to the south along Green Meadows Road, and the Rock Bridge Shopping Center roughly 1/3 of a mile if traveling west and south along Gray Oak Drive to Buttonwood Drive. As mentioned in brief above, the request under consideration is to rezone the entire property to the standard M-C zoning designation, not planned

development zoning. If approved, the site would be permitted to develop with any of the permitted M-C uses subject to all of the UDC regulations, including use-specific standards. The M-C district, by definition, is a “corridor” commercial district generally improved with businesses that are auto-oriented or require more significant levels of public visibility.

Staff noted that this project could be built under the existing plan, but that less parking would probably be mandated. Staff said they tend to believe that M-C should be restricted to higher level streets and roads. They believe that the best use should be more walkable and less intensive and would be more well-suited for M-N uses. The new request would allow some uses not allowed under the old plan and could include hotels, lumberyards, bars, adult retail, etc.

Given the characteristics of the subject property, applying such an intense use as being equivalent does not appear to be an accurate description of how this site would develop. Therefore, after considering the location and scale of the subject site, its surrounding land use mix, and its immediate adjacency to an established multifamily complex, staff believes that a “marketplace” designation is a more accurate description of the type and scale of commercial development that should be permitted on the site. Staff further finds that to achieve such a development outcome a rezoning to M-N (Mixed-use Neighborhood) would be appropriate, not the requested M-C designation. However, it is true that even small changes have to come through this body, and it could be beneficial to apply straight zoning designations.

It should be noted that PD zoning can be an impediment to development due to increased regulatory uncertainty and are more time consuming for staff, the Planning Commission, and the Council with limited added benefits. With the adoption of the UDC and its inclusion of new provisions that address neighborhood protections, enhanced buffering and land use transitions, and general building design guidelines, staff has become supportive of transitioning PD zoned property to comparable straight zoning designations provided such zoning is compatible with the surrounding development context and potential impacts can be mitigated through the new UDC provisions. Straight zones offer benefits to property owners and city staff in terms of a common set of rules and flexibility for market-driven site and use changes as long as they meet the UDC.

Overall, staff finds that the proposed zoning is generally consistent with the goals and objectives of Columbia Imagined to provide commercial services in this area, though staff believes this location is intended for a neighborhood marketplace type of commercial development rather than regional or destination commercial development. Given the zoning and land use mix of the area and access along a major collector rather than an arterial roadway, staff recommends the M-N zoning classification. Staff has some concerns the M-C zoning request may include uses that do not integrate well with the surrounding residential and office areas in terms of intensity, though staff also notes these concerns are greatly mitigated by the limited size of the site and the use-specific standards and neighborhood protections now contained with the UDC. Staff believes that the neighborhoods would lose too many protections if the new request was granted, so staff recommends denial.

Loe said she thought that they had moved some climax forest off of this area and that there was one section that was protected due to the nature of the property. Burns asked if this property was the subject of a development trade made approximately 5 years ago. Staff said they believed that there was some exchange was made then. It included a drainage easement and there are some drainage areas and wildlife areas protected.

The public hearing was opened and an engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the owner would like to develop the property, not sell it. It is 4 acres, basically, and the rest is steep and tree covered. A lot of the potential development has been voluntarily limited. This property is surrounded by high commercial uses, tire shops and although it looks like Planned – it is really surrounded by C-3 uses. The point is that there have been complaints from surrounding residential uses. The owner does not want to harm the surrounding residents since it is contrary to his own interests. They will actually lose some uses under this application.

Toohy asked if they already know what is going to be built there. The speaker said he did not know for sure, but it could be a bakery, a sports bar, a dry cleaner or something else that may not currently fit into the plan. It is not a good site for a convenience store. Loe asked if a bakery is not allowed in M-N. The speaker said that is what he understands.

Another speaker appeared. She lives on Green Meadows Road. She is concerned due to the traffic on Green Meadows since the students came back. When people come around that corner they really go fast, it is dangerous. We are concerned about adding to the traffic. There are so many deer out there. We are also concerned about the green space. Loe asked what the speaker would like to go on this parcel, if anything? She said she would like nothing. It is not relaxing to have more development in this area.

Another speaker appeared on behalf of the applicant. He noted that there is an 800-foot stretch in the middle of this road on the north side that is not commercial. He also noted that all C-P uses that were C-3 were allowed except gun clubs, mechanical contractors and some other unusual uses. They have M-C uses now, but we are moving away from Planned to straight zoning since it always requires additional hearings and it does not promote reasonable, allowed development of a reasonable property. He believed that this was a reasonable request that will not substantially change the generally allowed uses there now.

Public comment was closed.

MacMann said he was concerned about the climax forest across the street. He admitted that there is a Wal-Mart right there, but that there were a few properties that could be impacted. There was no further discussion.

**A motion to approve the request was made and seconded.
The motion was DEFEATED 6 to 2.)**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS
(None.)**

STAFF COMMENTS

At the next meeting there are currently three items to be considered. That meeting will occur on October 10. The items include:

- Centerstate Ruby Tuesday SOI Revision to allow for medical marijuana in a former restaurant space. (This would change the use only for this building and no other parcels in this planned area.)
- Rezoning at West Broadway and Stadium on the southeast corner. Three lots are involved and would be rezoned to M-OF for use as a medical office. (This item is expected to have a significant amount of public engagement.)

- The short-term rental issue is slated to be on the agenda on October 10. Short term rental regulations that have been developed by the P&Z Commission will be posted TOMORROW (September 20) on the city website and then emails will go out notifying update subscribers. No staff report is available yet. If the commission wanted to, they could table discussion of the short-term rental issue and move it to October 24, since the only thing currently scheduled for October 24 is a report regarding the Rock Quarry Scenic Overlay Stakeholder report.

In additional action, the staff has talked to the county about the creation of a West Columbia Area plan. The county is working on their approach to the issue. They will probably have some information before the end of the year, but the city will not move forward until they hear from the county. That means the first public meetings regarding such a plan will probably occur in the first quarter of 2020.

At the next work session, the Commission will be discussing updates to the Comprehensive Plan. To stay on track, the commission must hit some specific milestones in terms of time. No additional work sessions are currently scheduled for this topic at this time.

Staff asked commissioners to advise them of any known absences over the holidays. There will be two meetings in November since Thanksgiving does not fall on the Thursday when a Commission meeting is scheduled like it did last year.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

(None.)

It was announced that the commission had elected officers for the coming year during the work session meeting. Leadership positions remained the same as during the past term, with Sara Loe elected as Chair, Brian Toohey as Vice Chair and Tootie Burns elected as Secretary.

Commissioner Lee Russell announced that she will not be at the October 10th meeting

NEXT MEETING DATE - October 10, 2019 @ 7 pm

ADJOURNMENT

(Time:

© 2019 CityWatch-Columbia

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