

**Columbia Planning & Zoning Commission**

**Meeting Recap**

Council Chambers, Columbia City Hall

7:00 PM Thursday, August 6, 2020

**CALL TO ORDER (**Members present: Toohey, Burns, Russell, Carroll, Loe, MacMann, Stanton, Jones)

(Members absent: Rushing.)

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA** (Agenda approved as submitted.)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** ([Minutes from July 9, 2020](http://gocolumbiamo.legistar.com/gateway.aspx?M=F&ID=bb2e7d33-85b4-4fe4-b908-3db19dcf87aa.docx) approved as submitted.)

**SUBDIVISION**

**Case # 144-2020**

A request by McClure Engineering (agent), on behalf of 1 Fyfer Place, LLC (owners), for approval of a 1-lot final minor plat to be known as "Fyfer Place Plat 1." The plat combines two lots at the southwest corner of Fyfer Place and East Broadway into one, 0.38-acre lot for the purpose of developing the property with up to 4 residential units. The property is currently zoned R-MF (Multi-family Residential).

(Action: STAFF report

Has the character of single family but is technically multi-family. Access will be maintained on Fyfer. Meets the requirements of the UDC.

MacMann asked if there has been some stormwater issues on property just south of here. Staff did not know of any.

The public hearing was opened.

An engineer appeared on behelaf of the project but has not yet begun an engineering stufy of the site. Jones asked how different would the footprint be? Will you be paving everything there as is or will it be a little different? We don’t know for sure yet but there are restrictions in the new code that would prevent over development of the site basically.

The public hearing was closed.

A motion to approve was made.

The motion was approved unanimously, 8 -0.)

**SUBDIVISION & PUBLIC HEARING**

**Case # 135-2020**

A request by McClure Engineering (agent), on behalf of Boone Electric Cooperative (owner), for a one-lot final minor subdivision plat and design adjustments from Section 29-5.1 of the Unified Development Code relating to requests for an alternative location for the required utility easement on State Route 763 (Range Line Street) and to allow a structure (driveway) to be built over lot lines. The “Boone Electric Plat 2” includes approximately 19.22 acres of land located on the west side of Range Line Street, north of the Business Loop 70 and south of I-70 and addressed 1413 Range Line Street. The plat is desired to facilitate improvements to the Boone Electric Campus in accordance with their master plan.

(Action: This is a one lot final plat meeting ans so we are not currently holding Pubic Informati8on Meetings. This is a larger property, about 19 acres, and the Boone Electric Cooperative makes its main campus here. They would like to engage in some property improvement, so they will be making some additional grants of right-of-way and easement.

There are two design adjustments. On the front part of the property they would like to protect the Magic Tree that is important to them and subject to protection by the city.

Overall, staff believed that the two design adjustments could be ccomodateded.

The public hearing was opened.

An engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant. We have a new design that will have a new driveway desging that MoDot has seen, so we are just being transparent. MacMann commented that he was glad they were protecting the tree.

A motion to approve the final plat was made.

**The motione was approved unanimously, 8 – 0.)**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Case # 127-2020**

A request by A Civil Group (agent) on behalf of West Rock II, LLC (owners) for approval of a rezoning and development plan to be known as, "The Godfrey PD Plan." The applicant is proposing 4, 4-unit apartment buildings (16 units) with vehicular access onto Green Meadows Road. The 1.45-acre property is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Green Meadows Drive and Green Meadows Circle.

**(This item was tabled at the July 9, 2020 Planning Commission meeting).**

(Action: The applicants are seeking to rezone their property at the northwest corner of Green Meadows Road and Green Meadows Circle, from R-1 (One-family Dwelling) to PD (Planned District) to facilitate the construction of four apartment buildings, each housing four, two-bedroom units. The proposed PD plan depicts these units arranged around a central parking area, with 3 buildings to the west and one to the east. Each building is oriented to face the entry drive and parking area. Each unit includes a one-car garage (16 total spaces) and there are 34 on-site surface parking spaces provided for residents and visitors. The on-site surface parking provided is 15 spaces in excess of those required.

A concept review meeting was held in November 2019 to discuss the development of the subject property (see attached development proposal). At that time staff determined that the use of a planned district was appropriate in this location due to a number of factors, including the unique nature of the location and visual prominence of the property on Green Meadows Road, as well many site factors, like limited access, the shape of the lot, and the location of the property near the entrance to the Green Meadows and Greenbriar-Trail Ridge neighborhoods; both single-family developments. The stated objectives of planned districts are to allow for a mixture of housing types and uses, to provide more-usable open space and amenities, and provide, to the City, amenities or benefits that help achieve the goals of Columbia Imagined which are not otherwise required of the base zoning districts.

During the concept review, the potential project density and maximum number of dwelling units upon the subject site were discussed. It was concluded that a reasonable number of dwelling units would be approximately 12, which equates to a development density of approximately 8-9 dwelling units per acre. These conclusions were offered given the site’s proximity to Rock Bridge Christian Church, multiple single-family neighborhoods, and to at least two heavily trafficked intersections. Staff finds that the site is a transitional property providing a demarcation between more intense development generally to the south and east and less intense development to the north and west. Staff agrees that the subject site is a candidate for greater development densities than that of the contextual single-family housing to the north and west; however, also believes the density should be capped and use of the site should be more contextually sensitive through construction of housing forms more compatible with the less intensely developed areas surrounding the site.

The proposed setbacks shown on the PD plan reflect setbacks depicted on Rock Bridge Christian Church Plat 2, with 25’ on the Green Meadows Circle frontage, 15’ on Green Meadows Road frontage, and 20’ provided on the western property boundary. The 20’ setback is offered as a buffer between the proposed multi-family units and the church immediately to the west, and also accommodates a 16’ sanitary sewer easement serving the western residential units. While these setbacks are being shown on the PD plan, they are not considered consistent with the setbacks which would be required for the type of development now being proposed. The proposed setbacks would permit buildings to be located approximately 18’ from a major collector roadway. This is out of character with the area given all other multi-family uses are screened from Green Meadows by means of vegetation or berms and maintain setbacks 25’ or greater.

In response to review comments regarding the apparent reversal of the generally applicable setbacks for such development and its orientation, the applicant responded, “they desired to honor the recorded setbacks shown on Plat 2.” The recorded setbacks were based on the existing R-1 zoning of the property and access restrictions applicable to single-family development onto Green Meadows Road which is the only development presently permitted on the site. As a point of clarification, since Plat 2 was recorded the requirement that setbacks be shown on final plats has been eliminated from the platting requirements.

The proposed access to the subject site is from Green Meadows Road. This is permitted given the proposed development is multi-family. Staff is supportive of this access arrangement given that the existing single-family neighborhoods are almost exclusively accessed from the east via Green Meadows Circle; particularly for those homes on Greenbriar Drive and Melody Lane. Restricting access to the proposed development to Green Meadows Road will assist in minimizing potential increased traffic impacts from the new development. It should be noted that a proposed driveway to access the site’s trash collection dumpster would be accessible from Green Meadows Circle.

The proposed site design would require a design exception from the requirements of Section 29-4.7(f) which states that newly constructed structures shall provide front entrances oriented toward the street from which the property is addressed. The east-facing buildings (abutting the church property) generally face the intersection of Green Meadows Road and Green Meadows Circle; however, the west-facing building faces the internal parking lot and does not meet this requirement. The applicants are seeking relief from this requirement to allow the front entrance to be closest to the parking area, and to avoid the need for construction of sidewalks around the building and outward to connect to the existing public sidewalks.

Staff views the need for this design exception as evidence that the proposed building layout and density of the development exceed the capacity of the property. Fewer structures or a different building form would allow for compliance with this UDC provision. Approval of this exception would result in diminishing the visual quality and sense of arrival into the surrounding neighborhoods which is counter to the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and objectives of creating “livable and sustainable” neighborhoods that promote walkability and connectivity. Additionally, it should be restated that the applicant is seeking approval of the PD plan with the setbacks as shown. These setbacks are not consistent with adjoining development and are considered by staff, given the design of the project, to be reversed from what would be typically applied to this property.

Staff believes the requested PD (Planned District) zoning is appropriate for this location due the site’s constraints and the opportunity it afford developers to use creative solutions to mitigate contextual impacts. However, the proposed development plan appears to be an effort to maximize density on a high-visibility site that is located along a high-traffic corridor. The PD plan fails to incorporate enhanced amenities, quality open space for its users or the City, and offers little innovation in its design or housing options all of which are core purposes for why a property should be considered for rezoning to a PD district. Furthermore, the proposed setbacks shown on the Plan are contextually out of character with similarly dense developments along the Green Meadows corridor. The setbacks should be reestablished to ensure a proper setback is achieved from Green Meadows Road.

The 2019 concept plan for this site depicts a development pattern more contextually appropriate for this acreage. While the plan does not contain the same level of development intensity as the proposed PD plan, it is believed that the plan better supports the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan by introducing and providing opportunities to construct varied housing types within this location of the City.

Staff believes the setbacks should be resetablished and that the 2019 concept plan is a superior design

Staff recommends **DENIAL** of the zoning change and the associated requested design exception.

Burns asked for clarification on the parking spaces and bedroom spaces. This doesn’t leve a lot of parking for visitors. Staff explained that there are 32 regular spaces and 4 bike spaces identified, but there are actually more parking spaces in driveways that are not counted in this plan. MacMann asked about using the driveway spaces in front of grages and did not believe that it is always the best use. Staff indicated that tandem parking is not always invoked, and that someone parking in front of garage door, it would block accews to the grage. However, this is is a Planned District and in a Planned district you can change the parking ratios. Loe said she did not think there would be a lot of parking in front of garages since the access drive had been identified.

The public hearing was opened.

The first person to speak was the owner and developer. He does not simply intend to build this, but to maintain this over times. He is proposing 4 buiildings with 4 units per building. 8 units will be on the ground four which might be gret for older tenants. These could be affordable housing on the south side of town. I would like to provide affordable housing now. MacMann asked what the average rents would be. The speaker did not know. MacMann asked if the neighbors and staff thought that should be reduced by 25%, why not just do it? We could do it, but we don’t know why this can’t work.

Jones said the speaker’s mtives sounded good, but sh though he wa trying to do too much with this property. Our market won’t always be senior citizens, it could be anybody. Russell asked about the 15 foot setback after you spoke about what a nice place this was to walk. Why can’t you make a different plan that addresses that?The speaker said he would let his engineer address this issue.Russell said she could be more impressed with this project if he could protect green space.

Loe asked the speaker why he was asking for a design exception for putting the doors toward the front street. The speaker indicated that he would have one of the engineers respond to this.

The next speaker was an engineer on the project. He does not think they have reversed course on the plan and that it does not increase density, still has the same amount of green speace (50% vs 51%) .The buildings proximinty to Green Meadows does not provide any additional problems. This plan does identify and meet the appropiratiate width requirement for the road. He offered answer other questions about this project. MacMann said he thinks that this area is already a little dodgy and you are wanting to add a driveway? That is simply not a good idea. The engineer said it met with the technical requirements. We did a cursory traffic study. I believe that this road would only represent about 1% of the total traffic. Jones asked if you were a regular person, you would propbly want to use the back entrance. The speaker said there is not a back entrance, that is a place where ther is a dumpster. Loe ased about sideealks. The speaker noted that there will be additional sidewaalks built. There then became a discussion about accessibility and howmany pakring spots would hav to be dedicated and you could not tell someone that they could not use the parking spot in their garage. The engineer indicated that they only counted one of the spaces, so they could park in the garage or outside.

The next speaker was an engineer who worked on this project. He wanted to talk about density. Full Rmf is 17. We are asking for 11. This might actually be a pretty good place to put an access for this kind of density project. If you look at the surrounding developments this is generally lower in terms of density that others in this neighborhood area. You had asked about the 15 ft setback. The sidewalk is where it is, so this won’t ha=change where people walk in this area. I think we could make some thin that looks like an entrance on the back side of the one building if needed to comply with the front facing door, if necessary. Loe asked about some of the numbers of the surrounding projects.

The next speaker was another engineer from the project. He said he wanted to wrap up. Why 16 units instead of 12? Well, if you truly want to see affordable housing you will have to see density. If you want to see more units, the price will go down. Fewer units will make the cost go up. We do have some R-1 rights with this property already, but this semms more appropriate. I have work for the church when they owned the property. I worked for a company that want to make this commercial. That did not go over well. But in all of the meetings it was clear that they did not want any more parking on Green Meadows Circle and they thought that driveways should go toward Grean Meadows Road. I see this from a different perspective from staff. I see these buildings as about the same scale as many single family homes.

Carroll said she likes the discussions about affordability and saclae, but she doesn’t feel comfortable not knowing what the rate would be. The engineer said he does not know what the final building cost would be. The cost of building materials has b=gone up substanitlly since March of this year. It would be a challenge f=t fins another project degin that would guarantee the same amount of greenspace and that could provide workforce housing. MacMann said he has spent a lot of time talking about true affordable housing being about $800 per month. For workforce housing it goes up to $1000. The engfinner suggested that you could compare it to what is the typical cost of home owner hsip in this area. Maybe that could be $1500 to $1900 per month.

The next speaker said he lives on Green Meadows Circle He thinks this is a great place to live. I will be first to recognize that this is a challenging plot to develop. All the three neighborhood associations in the area are against this. This is going to be something someday. Give us something creative and inoovative and I will be for it.

The next speaker is a resident of a cloe neighborhood. Lets look at economic dignity. How do you get affordability? It is not just by stacking people on top of each other. It struck me as wrong that you can only have more affordability with higher density. People play with their kids and pets in this area. I am concerned that this will go away. I am concerned about the blending of this neighborhood. It just llooks like you are cramming something in here. I am interesested in $800 to $1,000. For some people, that will not be affordable. We need to keep this area tryuly residential according to the Strategic Plan.

Stanton said he wants a win-win.She thinks this is a tough place to develop. Stanton said that the owner has a lot of money in this and how can you make him be able to use this. She said she did not have the perfect answer.MacMann asked about the original idea to put 9 dingle family homes there instead of 4 4 plexes. The speaker said she would rather have the single family homes.

The public hearing was closed.

Russell said she has driven this road almost avery day since 1987. She thinks you could drop this 25%. She thinks we will actually be seeing the backs of some of thes building and she thinks there are traffic problems there already.

MacMann said he agreed with Russell that it is

Toohey asked if you look at the median household income. That might be $100,000 different than some property north of I-70 Just bringing that up.

Jones talked about potentially building speces with $1400 rents. I don’t see how this meets the goals. You could have similar affordability with single family r-1 dwellings.

Carroll said she wants to see more tranportaion accessible affordable housing, particularly in this part of town. I don’t think we can solve that large problem with this issue is in front of us now.

Stanton said he is very involved with affordable housing. This might not be a place for affordable housing. Maybe not even workforce housing. Maybe you need to sharpen you pencil a little and come up with something. But stop using affordable housing as a marketing device to win our hearts and minds.

Toohey said he agreed with Stanton and that this is not a good spot for affordable housing, but it might be a place for more attainablitiyt housing. Russell said she owns a house in this area that she rents out for $1,300. $1,400 rent is not affordable.

Loe said she thought the applicant had not really looked at the market. There are no sidewalks here. I don’t think this was well designed for your clients. I think that sliding in some more design f

eatures by the dumpster – I don’t plan to support this.

Burns indicated that this property was not there by itself, but surrounded by other neighborhoods that have property rights and traffic and safety cond=cerns as well. She sis not plan to support this request.

A motion was made to approve this project.

**The project was denied unanimously by a vote of 8 – 0.)**

**(The Chair adjourned the meeting for a short break.)**

**Case # 142-2020**

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of Kenneth and Becky Mohr (owners), for approval of a rezoning of 4 lots along East Texas Avenue from R-1 (One-family Dwelling) and R-2 (Two-family Dwelling) to M-OF (Mixed Use-Office). The 2.56-acre property is located on the north

side of Texas Avenue, approximately 650 feet west of Providence Road, and includes addresses 13, 103, 105, and 107 E Texas Ave.

(Action: Staff report

In a perfect workd, there would be a specific, distinct boundary between use districts. Even though this lies between commercial and residential, there is not a specific boundary, and this would move the transition area further to the west. M-OF may be a good transition zoning, and the new code seems to build in some setbacks and separations that might make this work. We do have a future land-use plan, but since part of this is not developed at all, this can have mixed results.

This decision would be really easy if we had a ore well-defined boundary. This has a cheallenge to determine where the line should be drawn to separate the uses, the zoning and the impacts.

Staff does recommend approval of the plan as presented, but understands that other options could be considered.

MacMann asked about what the maximum height would be? Staff said it was 35 feet. With some of the built in code protections, then this would be considered to be Level 3 buffer with 80% opacity at planting and setbacks built in depending on actual building height.

The public hearing was opened.

An engineer appeared on behalf of the project. He noted that this was 4 separate lotss with 2 single family homes and one older single family home. There is a day care use here. There are commercial uses directly adjacent to this property on two different sides. If you want to try to redevelop this area with the current R-1 and R-2 zoning, you would have to intall some sort of street to grant access. It might be better to pursue an M-OF zoning. This does meet the future land use plan and there are a wide range of uses allowed in the M-OF. What safeguards are guaranteed to the neighbors? Stormwater controls. Establishes a good, distinct zoning transition and the stbacks that were already mentiond.

Carroll asked how did the engineer determine that these would not be affordable housing units? He said that the lot size would be prohibitive in terms of rents. Jones asked about the roadway that runs in front of the properties. That is a private drive since

The public hearing was closed.

Burns asked staff if they had any response to any notivifications sent out by the city. The city said there were no responses. Carroll said she thought that whe wished that they knew more about what would happen on the property in the future. She noted that there is also a day care operating here.

Jones said she does not seem that there is any haste to make a change here, but it could happen if we give cart blanche zoning. Carrol said she is concerned about the housing impact and is also concerned about the fact that the day care could just stop doing that business tomorrow and that would not have anything to do with them.

Stanton said he thought the staff report was correct. It does provide some transition. He plnas to support this.

A motion ato approve was.

**The motion was approved 7 to 1, with Carroll voting NO.)**

**Case # 143-2020**

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of Troy and Shirley Miller (owners) for approval to permanently zone 2.87 acres from County R-S (Single-Family Residential) to R-1 (One-family Dwelling), upon annexation. The property is located approximately 0.25 miles south of the intersection of Kipling Way and St. Charles Road and is addressed 4000 Bradbury Drive.

(Action: Staff report.

Currently ther is a house and lgoon on the site. If annexed, it would connect to the city sewer system. This zoning would be fitting with surrounding uses and matches the future land use plan. Staff finds that this meets the general aspects of zoning required. This does not call for any new roadway constrictuion. However, earlier, ther was a pre-concept review that called for three lots to be here, but that is not a part of this request. That could happen in the future. However, a separate request for annexation will go straight to city council, so at this point, there will be at least two council meetings between what you do here tonight and the time when this comes up for a hearing.

MacMann said he went to this property but did not cross the property line.

Public comment was opened.

The first speaker lives on Bradbury. He has a concern about this because he worries tht we don’t need more traffic in this subdivision. What can the city do for us? Loe said this only deals with should this be single family if it were annexed. The speaker said OK, he understood, but could they later come back and seek an R-2 use? Loe said that would be an unusual request.

The next speaker said she lives on Bradbury. She said that there has been some talk about this is being done to get her a little more room for a driveway. So why are they taking the whold lot? Staff said that it is true that the owner of the lot described by the speaker is also the owner of the ot under consideration for annexation. In order to achieve all the things that have been discussed, there will have to be moany other things that happen first. First, it is not a legal lot either here or in the county. Second, the fire code will not allow a new street with new homes off of it to be served from a single road since that road already exceeds the current regulations. Property owner notifications have been difficult during the pandemic, but there will be several items that will have to be corrected in the future.

The speaker said this really affects the whole subdivision and that kids walk here and it should not just be the 3 or 4 houses around it. Staff said that they often send out notification to subdivisions, but tht is by courtesy, not mandate. If you had a recognized neighborhood association in this area, they would have received the notice. If you would like to form one, you can, and then you will likely be notified better about issues like this in the future.

The next speaker said that she was recently walking her dog from the house down the drive way……..

The public comment period was closed.

Carroll said she thinks that this ne3ighborhood needs an official association and the city can help set that up.

A motion to approve this request was made.

**The request was approved unanimously, 8 – 0.)**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**(None.)**

**STAFF COMMENTS**

Staff said that the last case will go to city council on September 21 with an actual annexation request and the introduction of this item..

Moon Valley Plat Number 1

600 and 602 Wilkes

Victory Christian Church for the creation of three addition residential lots

Rogers and College Reviision to add Sales of Medical Marijuana to the Statement of Intent.

Staff mentioned that there will be elections for officers of the P&Z Commission coming up soon along with continuing discussions about the Comprehensive Plan, revisions to the zoning code and other planning business.

**COMMISSION COMMENTS**

**NEXT MEETING DATE - August 20, 2020 @ 7 pm**

**ADJOURNMENT(Time:10:04 PM.)**
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