

**Downtown Columbia Leadership Council**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**August 26, 2014, 4:00 p.m.**  
**City Hall, Conference Room 1A**

**Members Present:** Sallie Coley, Columbia College  
Heiddi Davis, University of Missouri  
Pat Fowler, Neighborhood Representative  
Randy Gray, City Council Appointee  
Janet Hammen, Neighborhood Representative  
Sara Loe, Planning and Zoning Commission  
Karen Miller, Boone County Commission  
Nick Peckham, City Council Appointee  
Richard Perkins, Stephens College  
Deb Sheals, Community Improvement District  
\*Tim Teddy, Planning & Building Development Director  
Brian Treece, City Council Appointee

**Staff Present:** Tony St. Romaine, Assistant City Manager  
Heather Cole, Assistant to the City Manager

**Members Absent:** \*Mike Brooks, REDI  
Brent Gardner, Historic Preservation Commission  
Andrew Sommer, Downtown resident  
\*Phil Steinhaus, Columbia Housing Authority

* Indicates Ex-Officio status.
--------------------------------

**The meeting was called to order at 4:05.**

**Welcome/Introduce guests:** Sallie Coley has replaced Bob Hutton as the Columbia College representative. Other attendees included John Clark, 3<sup>rd</sup> ward Council person Karl Skala and several reporters.

**Approval of Minutes:** Ms. Fowler made a motion to approve the minutes as written; Mr. Gray seconded. All in favor; motion approved.

**Update on C2 Zoning:**

Mr. Teddy provided a handout and announced that Council approved the interim C2 zoning ordinance with several amendments relating to building height and minimum parking requirements. He provided copies of the approved ordinance. The handout can be viewed at the following link:

<http://www.gocolumbiamo.com/Council/Commissions/downloadfile.php?id=15014>

The group briefly discussed the building code requirement for elevators; these are only a required for buildings above 4 stories.

**Development Code Update:**

Clarion is requesting comments on Module 1; this includes what is permitted in certain areas, special conditions, and conditional uses.

Mr. Gray voiced concerns about the interim ordinance and height requirements; this could become an issue long term. A blanket ten story restriction is not the most appropriate and the Charrette report has specific language for recommending staggering heights. Mr. St. Romaine explained that Council had a long discussion on the interim requirements and did not want to get into height in the interim, but it would likely be for the long term.

Mr. Teddy explained Council's discussion of the interim ordinance and how they dealt with certain aspects of the ordinance. Under the new amendment, new residential units and existing buildings could be converted into space without having to provide parking. Units on Broadway have a street oriented use, meaning that the piece of the building that faces Broadway must have a door.

Mr. Peckham commented that utilizing the City's GIS Department could be beneficial and the Committee could have a build out diagram with details of each building; Mr. Teddy agreed that this could be beneficial during the code test stage. Mr. St. Romaine explained that he spoke with Matt Gerike, GIS Manager, who spoke with the University of Missouri about working together on a model; the University has expressed interest in collaboration.

The Committee briefly discussed CVS Pharmacy. If a permit is issued to developers, they do not have to follow the 24 foot height requirement; a permit has not been issued.

**Review and Adopt Final Infrastructure Report:**

Ms. Fowler requested an editable document for committee members to track changes; this would identify any suggested changes to the document. The group wanted more time to wordsmith as well as provide suggestions and comments.

Ms. Hammen suggested hiring an official editor for the document; Mr. Peckham thought that the committee could finalize the report for Council without outside assistance. He voiced concerns about sending a word doc for editing and having individuals working off different versions. Ms. Hammen and Ms. Fowler would like to see more attribution, footnotes, and less opinion.

Ms. Miller pointed out changes on page 11 referring to the Hamilton Project report that was referenced. She suggested looking more closely at these items and would also like a list of soft infrastructure to help the community understand. Her biggest concern was the first recommendation and that it should be toned differently. She recommended beginning with a footnote and stating an explanation and not making it personal and targeting a single person.

There is a sense of distrust in the local government among community members and the infrastructure is an example of this. Mr. Peckham agreed that naming one specific person isn't needed; but felt that there is a need to have an explanation of the confusion and lack of communication in writing. Ms. Miller agreed to aid in rewriting this recommendation.

Ms. Miller's final suggestion was to update numbers; Mr. St. Romaine has these and will provide for the report.

Ms. Sheals advised she needed to take the CID bonding recommendation to the CID Board prior to commenting.

Ms. Davis wanted more time to review development charges, sufficiency of services and how those related to the University. She advised she would not vote to approve the report as it stood, without more review time.

Ms. Hammen suggested including more recent images to show the changes that have occurred. Mr. Gray agreed that a thorough assessment should be included to show how we got to this place. There were conscious decisions to spend funds elsewhere and unless it is dealt with, it will continue to occur.

It was thought that development expanded at a greater rate than was expected and infrastructure is expensive. This report should serve to point out the need for more strategic thinking in planning and especially in CIP planning; many of these projects are unfunded.

Mr. Treece mentioned that the Mayor and Council asked for this report and recommendations in April and since then there have been discussions and other measures taken, including development ballot fees. These solutions are being made without the input of the DLC.

The Committee agreed to take another month to review; comments should be sent to Heather Cole for inclusion in the document. This will be reviewed at the September meeting.

**Other Topics:**

Ms. Fowler requested a copy of the cost of service study; Mr. St. Romaine will provide via email.

**Public Comment:**

John Clark; there is a 20-day window for input on Clarion's Module 1; this is the time they will address any issues or concerns. He suggested removing the CID funding portion of the report; downtown properties should help pay for infrastructure. This is premature recommendation, and suggested deleting the section entirely. He urged the DLC to raise the elevator issue with Clarion, and have it added as part of the C2 downtown module. Lastly, he suggested keeping the maintenance versus growth section. This discussion has to do with funding and who will fund projects.

**Next meeting:** The next meeting is scheduled for September 23, 2014.

**Adjourn:**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:22 p.m.