



Columbia Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Recap

Council Chambers, Columbia City Hall
7:00 PM Thursday, May 4, 2017

CALL TO ORDER (Members Present: Strodman, Burns, MacMann, Rushing, Toohey, Harder, Loe and Russell)
(Members Absent: Stanton)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Approved as submitted.) (No ex-parte contact reported.)
APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Minutes from April 6, 2017 approved.)

TABLING REQEUSTS

Case # 17-107

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of Bristol Lake Home Owners Association Number 1, Inc. (owner) to annex 0.79 acres into the City of Columbia and apply R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) as permanent zoning. The subject site is located approximately 500 feet east of Bearfield Road, 1,300 feet north of Gans Road, and north of Lot C4 of Bristol Lake Plat 1 subdivision.

(Action: **Request to table to June 8, 2017 meeting granted by unanimous vote.**)

SUBDIVISIONS

Case # 17-93

A request by McGrath Marjorie Revocable Intervivos Trust, Chong, Lisenby, Jesse, Gianino, Hristov & Misirova (owners) for a revised preliminary plat to be known as Creeks Edge, Plat 1-B. The 5.3-acre subject site is located at the northeast corner of Sawgrass Drive and Valhalla Court.

[Staff Report to Planning and Zoning Commission](#)

(Action: Staff presented the report as indicated. The key issue in the request to revise the preliminary plat had to do with the ability of adjoining landowners to change the designation of a common lot that buffers private homes from a clubhouse/pool area and responsibility for the maintenance of that parcel. Adjoining landowners were reportedly in support of the proposal, but some members of the Homeowners Association in the area were opposed. Staff cited a section of the City of Columbia Code that indicated that such requests could be denied for cause, but recommended approval of the request.

Burns asked about an existing fence bordering the backs of the neighboring properties. Staff did not know the answer to this question.

Public comment was opened.

First speaker indicated that he was a neighboring property owner. He addressed the issue of the fence and indicated that that fence would be replaced by berms and other screening techniques. Did not know the fate of the existing fence in terms of the overall improvements intended. Explained that liability would be reduced for the neighborhood association since less land would be under the responsibility of the neighbors. Also, indicated that this did provide a benefit for the immediate neighbors and caused no harm to others. Indicated that he did NOT have any indication of general support from the whole homeowners' association.

No further public comment was provided.

Loe indicated that notwithstanding the report of the staff, there was a question about transferring the current land to private ownership could diminish the amount of land available for common use. Staff indicated that the name of a plat does not confer use, but that it is a common lot currently and it can only be used for uses identified in the original plan. Staff indicated that it did not believe that it caused a problem for the overall neighborhood by virtue of its intended use. Staff indicated that it does not review HOA regulations when rendering its opinion.

Rushing offered a motion to approve. No additional discussion. **Motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 2 with one abstention by Loe.**

Case # 17-105

A request by TREKK Design Group (agent) on behalf of Columbia Housing Authority (owner) for approval of a one-lot final plat, constituting a resubdivision of existing lots, to be known as "Bryant Walkway Apartments II - East". The 0.42-acre R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) zoned property is located at the northeast corner of Park Avenue and Trinity Place.

(Action: Staff indicated that this is considered to be a minor replat and that it consolidates parts of lots into a single platted lot since the new code does not allow building across lot lines. It actually eliminates lot lines that were already built over. Staff recommended approval.

No public comment was entered.

Motion to approve made by Loe. **Motion approved unanimously.)**

Case # 17-106

A request by TREKK Design Group (agent) on behalf of Columbia Housing Authority (owner) for approval of a three-lot final plat, to be known as "Bryant Walkway Apartments II - North". The 3.07-acre R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) zoned property is located at the northwest corner of Trinity Place and Allen Street.

(Action: Staff report indicated that this replat was similar to the previous replat but includes an entire block. This request redraws lot lines to ensure that lot lines are not built over, that minimum lot size is preserved and that all easements are granted as needed.

Question about why this was being pursued. Staff indicated that it had to do to some extent with a request for tax credits.

No public testimony.

Motion to approve made by MacMann. **Motion approved unanimously.**)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 17-108

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of Welcome Home, Inc. and Mid-Missouri Veterans, LP (owners) for a major amendment to the C-P plan known as "Veterans Campus". The subject site is located at 2112 and 2120 Business Loop 70 East. The applicant is seeking an additional screening variance for Lot 2, and is updating the C-P plan to match the plat (Case # 15-18) of the property.

(Action: Staff report was presented as indicated. The primary issues involved were 1) clarification of screening requirements between two parcels of land on this campus; and 2) the addition of a monument sign not shown on the original plan. Staff recommended approval of the request. At the time of the original request, the entire lot was under single ownership and it was determined that owners should not be required to screen against themselves. When this was divided, some screening requirements were inadvertently carried forward. This request asks that until the lot to the south is developed, no screening should be required.

Question about intensity of parking was posed by Loe. A representative of the applicant appeared and indicated that the property to the south had no plans for development and that the screening requirement should be eliminated. Also, indicated that the monument sign request was supposed to be a part of the original request. Indicated that parking level was the same as the initial approval, that it did include four extras parking stalls, but that it is offset by the non-use of the southern property. There is a shared parking situation going on right now and actually some additional parking could be beneficial to both properties, but no additional parking was being requested.

Speaker indicated without new screening, his home, which is in close proximity, would not receive the screening required to protect his home and that he has experienced construction disruption and would experience further disruption if additional stormwater improvements are made or if the southern lot is used for gardening. He believed that this whole project has impacted him and will continue to and that he does not want to allow ANY variance from the rules. Believes that the Ammonette community is a special community and that he has lived there almost life-long. This new development impacts him and his neighbors.

MacMann asked if there was already a variance that existed between the previous speaker and the existing property. Staff indicated that that was true. Neighbor indicated that the two properties were acting in concert and he did not want to extend any further screening variances.

Next speaker indicated that she lived on Ammonette Street and that she was asking for protection for he area to protect local animals that currently live there.

No further public comment.

Commissioner asked who owns the southern lot. Staff indicated that it was owned by a city entity. Russell asked if there was gardening activity going on on that parcel. The answer was that it was limited local gardening. Burns asked if there had been discussions with the neighbors. Speaker for the applicant

indicated that there had NOT been such discussions, primarily because this was an extension of an already existing exemption.

Loe asked if the other screening requirements had been met. Staff indicated that they had been met on the southwest corner, but that screening between northern and southern properties was not required and that gardening activities on the southern lot had been identified as an allowable use. This request does not affect any environmental mitigation requirements that may be installed in the future.

MacMann made the motion to approve. Burns asked that additional discussion occur between the neighbors and Crockett Engineering. MacMann believe that this was simply a variance request that did not directly impact the nearby property owner. Rushing believed that the neighborhood testimony and the current request were two different issues. Burns wanted to state for the record that she thought more discussion should occur between the neighbors and the builder. Believed that such discussions should occur before this goes to Council for final approval.

Motion to approve was approved unanimously.)

Case # 17-112

A request by the City of Columbia Community Development Department for adoption of the Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO) Major Roadway Plan (MRP).

[Staff Report to Planning and Zoning Commission](#)

[CATSO Major Roadway Plan Map](#)

(Action: Staff report was presented as indicated. This case basically asks the City to adopt the CATSO Major Roadway Plan (CATSO MRP) as the official base plan for future roadway improvements. It does not bind the city to financing of any individual roads or plan improvements, but it does eliminate discrepancies between the CATSO MRP and the city's MRP that have occurred over time. It does not preclude amendments to the plan in the future – and the proposal does include a suggested method for amendment to the plan in the future. That process would not allow changes to the plan unilaterally by the City Council, but would provide a mechanism for making such changes to the plan. The City of Columbia has significant representation on the CATSO decision-making committee and this proposal will provide more consistency for longer-term planning. Staff recommends approval of the proposal as submitted.

MacMann asked if combining the various plans would allow for amendment. Staff indicated that it would but that there would not be redundant approvals required. Rushing asked if the plans were virtually the same. Staff indicated that they were similar, but that the City had added a change to the Cinnamon Hill layout and it needs to be reflected in the overall plan. That is one example. The City does have good representation on the CATSO decision making board, so there should not be great conflict. Staff suggested that any amendments come to Council FIRST, then go to CATSO, rather have the Council unilaterally approve changes. Tonight's request does not mandate all of these restrictions, but they are recommended.

MacMann made the motion to approve. **Motion was approved unanimously.)**

COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC

(None.)

COMMENTS OF STAFF

(Action: Staff indicated that next meeting will be on May 18. There are a “plethora” of items coming forward. 5 items including Old Hawthorne, Wellington Estates and another Dunkin Donuts on 763 just south of Blue Ridge. No further comments. Capital Improvement Projects comments from P&Z will be forwarded to Council.)

COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

(None.)

NEXT MEETING DATE - May 18, 2017

ADJOURNMENT

(Time 8:15 PM.)

© 2017 CityWatch-Columbia

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

DO NOT COPY