

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
April 4, 2013

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

**Ms. Ann Peters
Dr. Ray Puri
Mr. Steve Reichlin
Mr. Karl Skala
Mr. Rusty Strodman
Mr. Bill Tillotson
Mr. Matthew Vander Tuig
Mr. Doug Wheeler**

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Mr. Andy Lee

II.) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. WHEELER: Everyone's had a chance to look at the agenda; is there any changes needed? Motion to approve?

MR. SKALA: So moved.

MR. STRODTMAN: Second.

MR. WHEELER: Motion's been made and seconded. Everybody say aye. Opposed, same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

III.) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. WHEELER: Hopefully everyone's had a chance to review the March 21, 2013 minutes. Any corrections needed? Motion for approval?

MR. REICHLIN: So moved.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Reichlin.

MR. TILLOTSON: Second.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson. Everybody in favor, say aye. Opposed, same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

IV.) SUBDIVISIONS

13-39 A request by Allstate consultants, on behalf of Michael Keevins, for a one-lot, final minor plat to be known as Keevins Estate, Plat 1. The 25-acre site is located west of Rock Quarry Road, 250 feet north of Stags Way.

MR. WHEELER: May we have a Staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Matthew Lepke of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the minor plat.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any questions of Staff? Seeing none. This wasn't a public hearing, but it has been our practice to allow any comments if there's any additional information we need. Seeing none, Commissioners, discussion? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: This seems pretty straightforward to me, and unless anybody has any other comments, I'd move for approval.

MR. WHEELER: Motion's been made to approve.

MR. REICHLIN: I'll second.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Reichlin. Motion's been made and seconded. Any discussion on the motion? When you're ready.

MR. VANDER TUIG: We have a motion and a second to approve Case No. 13-39, a request by Allstate consultants, on behalf of Michael Keevins, for a one-lot, final minor plat to be known as Keevins Estate, Plat 1.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Peters, Dr. Puri, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Skala, Mr. Strodman, Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Vander Tuig, Mr. Wheeler. Motion carries 8-0.

MR. WHEELER: Recommendation for approval will be sent to City Council.

V.) PUBLIC HEARINGS

13-29 A request by the Doris Overton Trust (owner) to annex 26.4 acres of land into the City of Columbia, and to assign RMH (Residential Manufactured Home) as permanent City zoning. A preliminary RMH development plan is included for review, as required by Section 29-11(e) of the Zoning Regulations. (This project was tabled at the March 21 meeting to tonight.)

MR. WHEELER: May we have a Staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Steve MacIntyre of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends the following:

1. Approval of RMH as permanent City zoning.
2. Approval of the proposed preliminary RMH development plan, including approval of all requested variances.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any questions of Staff? Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: Where's the existent sewer line -- the city sewer line?

MR. MACINTYRE: The existing city sewer line is about a mile -- or I believe it's over a mile to the north. And they would actually have to pump it -- they'd have to extend that, the applicant or the developer, would have to extend that line and probably upgrade a city pumping station to pump the sewer from this up and over into the gravity lines, affluent or a sewer plan.

MR. ZENNER: Currently, that line, Ms. Peters, is serving the Discovery Ridge development, so it is just to the east of the interchange at Discovery Ridge and US 63. This original request, actually, was a much larger annexation request for about a total of 138 to 150 acres. And in the process of discussing with the applicant the appropriateness of bringing in the property further to the south and to the east of this, the request was reduced to only include the mobile home development at this time, to allow for the sewer to reach it, take the existing lagoons offline, and having the public trunk sewer in that location to further serve the remaining land that is owned by the Overtons in the future at a different

annexation request. So really what we're setting up at this point is the opportunity to potentially bring in the existing auto auction parcel and then vacant land to the east of it that may be utilized for a different non-commercial purpose in the future.

MS. PETERS: And did I hear you correctly? The applicant's paying for the entire mile of sewer?

MR. ZENNER: That would be correct. That is the City's policy as well as upgrading the existing lift station that would basically be able to support the affluent flow. Chad Sayre with Allstate Engineers is here if you have detailed questions as it relates to that, but that is our understanding and that would be the standard city policy.

MS. PETERS: It was just a curiosity question. I don't think I need a lot more detail on it, but thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Skala?

MR. SKALA: Yeah. I think it's a reasonable assumption that the sewage lagoons are on the low part of this property, and that's the necessity for the pumping station to pump it up to the -- to the northern connector. Is that -- is that assumption correct?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. The property does drain from north to south. Actually, that open space, the half-hatched area in the center is kind of a drainage that flows from north to south through the site. But it does continue uphill all the way to Discovery Ridge.

MR. SKALA: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Vander Tuig?

MR. VANDER TUIG: I'm curious. Does the sewer department -- have they planned for serving this water shed with the infrastructure that was put in probably five years ago, I think, across 63? I mean, it wasn't too long ago that that trunk sewer was put in; six years, seven.

MR. MACINTYRE: That's a good question and I don't actually know the extent of the planning that went in or what they anticipated in terms of how far the City's limits would extend down this way. I would expect at some point to become impractical to have sewage pumped from a certain distance, but -- you know, a certain quantity, that that would, at some point, become impractical. However, I'm not sure of the details of how that works. As far as this project's concerned, and even the earlier request which was withdrawn and resubmitted with this smaller portion, the -- we haven't heard any comments from them expressing concerns about capacity in our overall plan to accommodate sewer that would be added.

MR. ZENNER: Again, Mr. Sayre is here with Allstate Engineering, which did coordinate design as it relates to the sanitary line and had meetings, as I understand it, when we did the preliminary review on this with our sewer authority or utility. It is, if I recall correctly -- and Chad may be able to correct Staff as well as inform you more as to the details associated with that. The capacity is not the issue. It is the pump station capacity that may need some upgrading. The line capacity exists, not

necessarily the pumping capacity though, and Chad can maybe address that more for you if you have additional questions.

MR. VANDER TUIG: All right. Thanks.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: I had a question that was not related to sewer, so I wanted to make sure we're -- if there was any more sewer questions before I change the subject. The roads inside this area, are they all paved now or is there any gravel roads in there, any gravel driveways?

MR. MACINTYRE: I believe they are. I drove through this site and I did not see any unpaved areas. However, I think that Mr. Wendling might be able to speak on a few areas where there might be small patches of gravel, as I understand it. I haven't seen them myself, but they've been described.

MR. WHEELER: If you will, just hold off and then we'll see -- we'll get done with Staff and you can enlighten us. All right. Mr. Reichlin?

MR. REICHLIN: Could Staff briefly review what existing requirements there are for the quality of a mobile home in a park in the city? That's the first question. The second part of that question is, upon review of this existing condition, what do you -- how do you assess -- what's the Staff's opinion about whether or not the existing mobile homes there now meet the requirement of a mobile home park within the city of Columbia? So that's a two-parter.

MR. ZENNER: Well, I mean, I think, Mr. Reichlin, if I understand your question correctly, there are -- the City of Columbia will not -- if you bring a new mobile home into the city of Columbia, it must meet a particular design requirement and standard. Existing mobile homes that are brought in through annexation, such as this, are, in essence, considered grandfathered. So as it relates to the standard of what is out there today, those mobile homes that are there -- and, again, Mr. Wendling may be able to speak to this, or Mr. Sayre, as to the quality of what is there and their compliance with codes that existed when they were brought into the site. Anything that is changed out, however, must meet tie-down standards, must meet other -- sealed standards from manufacturing and a variety of other things. That's all part of our -- part of our code. As far as for infrastructure replacement or infrastructure standards internal to the development itself, such as the roadways, the expansion section, which is identified here as proposed, aside from the requested variances, such as street width, all other standards would apply. So you wouldn't be dealing with gravel streets within the new section. You may be dealing with a street that is outside of a platting right-of-way however. So not unlike what we did with --

MR. MACINTYRE: Pine Grove.

MR. ZENNER: -- Pine Grove, which is off of Clark Lane, last year -- we did a mobile home park expansion -- we allowed the existing portion of that park to remain as it was, which would be, in essence, significantly nonconforming to today's mobile home park -- or RMH standards. The new section, however, was compliant, subject to a series of variances. The mobile homes that would go into that newer section or be changed out in the older would have to meet with our current requirements. I

believe it's '76 or beyond. We don't allow anything in that's older than 1976. So hopefully that answers your question. And I think the second half of that Steve may be able to answer, unless I already did.

MR. MACINTYRE: I think you answered --

MR. REICHLIN: I think you already did, yeah.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you.

MR. REICHLIN: So just to make sure I understand you correctly, as it sits right now, the majority of the homes in that park would not meet what would be expected of a current standard.

MR. ZENNER: I'd have to let Mr. Wendling speak to that. We don't know the status of each of the individual mobile homes. What we do know is in the existing portion of the park there is a desire to take out single-wide units and replace them with larger double-wide units, which would be more contemporary under today's standards, as well as accommodate the needs of the tenants that are desiring to occupy the community that is here. So you will likely see an upgrade of the units over time as they eliminate single-wide lots that may only have a 12- or 14-foot wide unit on them with a double wide, which may be a standard of 32 by whatever length. So they will probably see a progressive upgrade of the park over time. This is not your typical RMH request to eliminate the park. It is basically to bring it in into compliance, subject to the series of variances, to allow for this particular type of product to exist for the residents. There is no desire at this point, to our knowledge, to eliminate the park at any point in the future for other types of development.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any other questions of Staff? I have one. So RMH under our pyramid is a higher classification than multi-family, R-3. Is that not correct?

MR. MACINTYRE: It's a planned district technically.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. Let me rephrase my question. Would we not be allowing multi-family zoning under RMH?

MR. MACINTYRE: (Shook head.)

MR. WHEELER: No. They'd have to come back and request the zoning change.

MR. MACINTYRE: Right. It's a separate district, stand alone.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. All right. And so, in that case, then the variances we're granting today would have no bearing on that. They'd have to ask for that later. So setbacks within a new zoning classification would be --

MR. MACINTYRE: Correct. Yes. That's correct.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. All right. Thanks for correcting me. I appreciate that. Any other questions of Staff? We'll open public hearing. Oh, sorry. Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: One question of Staff: Is the neighboring property already annexed into the city?

MR. MACINTYRE: I'm sorry. Did you say the neighboring park?

MS. PETERS: Neighboring property, which I believe is Channel 8 or the University of Missouri.

MR. MACINTYRE: Oh, yes. To the north, that property is in the city and, of course, they do need to be contiguous, which they are by crossing Old Mill -- Old Millers Road.

MS. PETERS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: That brings up a question there. Are they going to utilize Mr. Wendling's new sewer line?

MR. MACINTYRE: That's a good question. I don't know.

MR. WHEELER: Just curious.

MR. MACINTYRE: I don't believe there's any development on that site currently, so it might actually be up toward Discovery Ridge where the -- where they are using the line currently. As far as future development on those sites, I suppose it's possible.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Vander Tuig?

MR. VANDER TUIG: Well, I'll just follow up. Is -- I read this in the Comprehensive Plan draft, so I should remember, but what is the policy for reimbursement of sanitary sewer tie-ins? I thought I read something about that, but that poses an interesting twist when it's a force main.

MR. ZENNER: You're referring to the Green Line -- the Green Line process or the Green Line policy that exists. If I recall correctly, there is a 20-year recapture or 20-year time frame in which that line can -- the developer can recapture. I believe it is an option within the city code if it is to serve other adjacent property. And I'd have to -- I'd have to look into that specifically. We don't often get asked that question, so I apologize. But it does -- there's a procedure that exists within the code that would allow for the developer to recapture their investment over a 20-year window.

MR. VANDER TUIG: All right. Thanks a lot.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any other questions of Staff? All right. Now, we're going to open the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. WHEELER: Our rules of engagement are the primary speaker will get six minutes. Subsequent speakers will get three minutes, and that's true of the applicant and any opposition.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. Garrett Taylor, 1103 East Broadway; I represent the Doris Overton Trust, the applicant there. Chad Sayre with Allstate Consultants is going to hand out a presentation we've got, which I'm not going to go through the full presentation because most of it's contained in the Staff report. However, I do want to give out this presentation for the sole purpose of flipping through for everyone to see the photos -- and those photos of the park begin on Page 11 -- because I want everyone to see that the High Hill Circle Mobile Home Park is a very well maintained, crime free, affordable housing park that, again, the -- we can discuss -- or Mr. Wendling can get up here and discuss it, but most of the homes -- maybe a couple of them would not meet the City's standards. As you'll flip through, you'll see these homes are very nice, newer homes. And, again, I don't know if that's addressed some of your questions that you had, Mr. Reichlin, in regards to the quality of the homes and I don't know that that's even what you were asking. But one of the main things I wanted to do was to

get this presentation in front of you so you could have photos of the existing High Hill Mobile Home Park. I know there were also some questions in regards to sewer, so I'll set Chad Sayre from Allstate come up as well. But before I sit down, I just wanted to know if there was any questions.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any questions of this speaker?

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

MR. SAYRE: My name is Chad Sayre and I work at Allstate Consultants at 3312 Lemone Industrial Boulevard. And as far as the sewer, this process started back in the fall, and the reason for us -- the motivation, if you will, is the lagoon itself is ready for a permanent renewal. We have conditions on that for improvements and we are recommending to eliminate this discharge and eliminate this lagoon. And the difference between now and five years ago is that the city sewer is about a mile closer now than what it was even five, six -- someone brought it up -- six -- about six or seven years ago. And so in meeting with the sewer administration and also the Planning Staff on numerous times, our proposal is to put in a -- basically what will become a regional pump station and pump through a force main. Our current goal is to go across the University of Missouri property, which is the majority of the easement area that we would need. Mrs. Overton already has a current agreement with the University and Boone County actually where we pump the affluent currently over the hill, if you will, into the Gans watershed. And so that was one of the -- Commissioner Skala, back in the watershed trading days in the Clinton administration and we used that to defer this until the sanitary sewer was closer. So right now it's motivation -- we are recommending this as a regional solution that's a permanent solution and the City's current policy would require the developer to pay 100 percent of that cost. So that's our current proposal and recommendation to the Overton family. So it is about 7,000 feet. Right now the believe is we won't have to upgrade the current pump station, looking at the hydraulics with the city staff that the actual requirement would be that we'd be able to tie into the existing force main, which is short and then goes into a large gravity main. And they had already accounted for some off-watershed capacity, if you will, need there in their standard sizing. So we don't have a capacity issue is the believe of the current -- currently, but we still have to do final plans and it has to go through the city process. So the other thing about gravel drives: Currently you'll find -- and we learned a lot. It's been -- it's been some time since the City and everybody has gone through this process. And back in the mid 90's I was involved in that and had more hair and several of you were too. And so -- but those have evolved. And this really is structured -- it's a planned zoning. It allows us to, you know, do what the tenants want, and that is they don't want large yards, they don't want their own lot. I lived in a mobile home park that's now gone, Columbia Regency, for three and a half years, my wife and I, when I was in college. And the maintenance -- the Overtons run a very tight ship. And they have all pavement except for one area and that's around a maintenance building. They have a maintenance area that meets the city requirement from the standpoint exceeds a lot of what we think are important city requirements as far as accessory vehicle parking. And I know Staff would tell you it's very clean. It's daily maintenance. They have a full-time maintenance person that takes care of all

these things. As far as the codes for the homes, you'll find out there that -- I think you would have to -- I don't know that there's any. But their pads exceed requirements. They're all required to be tied down to meet the state requirement from that perspective. And you won't see -- if you've noticed, you know, you won't see them on the news whenever other places are incurring damage from wind and weather and stuff because they have a -- they have quite an operation out there. They've owned it for almost four decades. The homes are modernized regularly, you'll see. They have families that live there because they don't have to mow a big yard. And all of the fees, if you will, are included in their lot fee, and their lot fee is quite competitive. It's -- or it's quite low. And part of the reason -- I talked to Doris -- Mrs. Overton just today and it was because of the economy and also because she's been waiting to see what the solution is here so she can absorb these -- help absorb these costs and still maintain competitive, affordable rates. So then -- so there is some gravel and it's around the maintenance building. But they currently have -- meet or exceed all of the concrete requirements, all the street requirements. They do all the snow pushing. There's -- like I say, there's a firm here tonight even that takes care of all that, so -- so I want you to know that the driving force is really because we want to remove this facility from the Bonne Femme and plan for the future. We're going to size this pump station, our best -- we're going to work with the City Staff and size the pump station so that it'll follow your current development procedures, where the City will have to approve its capacity, its layout, the easements. All of those things will have to be approved before this will become final. Is there anything else I could help answer while I'm here as far as questions?

MR. WHEELER: Are there any questions of this speaker? Mr. Vander Tuig?

MR. VANDER TUIG: Is the lift station going to be turned over to the jurisdiction too?

MR. SAYRE: Yes. Yes. It'll have to meet the current City requirements. The pump station improvements that Steve or Pat was talking about was not with the upgrade -- it is an upgrade, but the City requires that we communicate -- that this new pump station that will be placed at the lower side of the proposed area will have to communicate with the other pump station. And there's a telemetry requirement that the Public Works staff has told us about from the beginning that we haven't resolved yet. But there is some upgrades, but not as far as pumping capacity. It -- we're not going to affect its pumping capacity.

MR. WHEELER: Any other questions of this speaker? Thank you.

MR. SAYRE: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any other speakers?

MR. WENDLING: Good evening, Commissioners and Staff. My name's Steve Wendling; I've got offices at 555 East Green Meadows Road, Suite 9. And I came up for you to take shots, but first I'd just like to state that the Overtons -- Mrs. Overton happens to be my mother-in-law, so -- and they've owned this property for 46 years. It's been a mobile home court almost that entire time. And one of the things that we do -- and I'll interject here: We also own and operate Richland Heights Mobile Home Court, the last mobile home court inside the city limits that was accepted and built to city standards, so

we're very familiar with everything that goes into it and what's going to need to be accomplished over time. But one of the things, we take a lot of pride in the courts. We have a sign posted that says, We have rules; if you can't comply, don't apply. And we're very adamant about that. Some of the homes, there may be one or two in there that don't meet the current aging, but one of the things that the Overtons have always tried to accomplish is to have affordable living. And they're not going to force someone to move out when they can't afford to by telling them they have to upgrade their home. We do have arrangements with the mobile home dealership that will give them discounts in order to help and assist that. As Chad said, the lot rents are probably the lowest around. It's 167.50 and 175 per month. We provide a 10 percent discount for seniors. So we try to go above and beyond on everything that we can do. The -- eight to ten years ago, my father-in-law, Jack Overton -- sorry. It's four years ago today he passed away. He put a walking trail in eight to ten years ago for the mobile home court for the tenants -- and that's long before it got to be the rule of the day to put it in -- so they'd have someplace to go and exercise, where kids could go ride their trikes and things and not be in the street. And so one other thing is that one of our rules is that we don't allow any pets over 40 pounds and -- to the point that my own daughter, I had to move her out because she had a pet pound dog that she had adopted and he got to be about 45 to 50 pounds. She did. Still has the dog, it's a great dog, but she couldn't live in the court. So if you have any other questions, I'd be more than happy to address them.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any questions of this speaker? Thank you, Mr. Wendling.

MR. WENDLING: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: All right. Are there any other speakers on this item tonight?

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. WHEELER: Commissioners, discussion? Mr. Skala?

MR. SKALA: Well, I guess I'll start. I think that most of the questions about the sewer connections have been answered adequately. Certainly the Staff has -- the Staff recommendation is for approval here. What strikes me over the -- as you might know, over the past few weeks I have visited many mobile home parks or RMH parks, and they range from -- from not -- not so good to really, really nice. One of the ones that comes to mind is the one in back of Home Depot, which is a really nice park. And I'm very concerned -- we have always been concerned in this group and lots of others about affordable housing. That's a very compelling argument. We -- we've found lots of these parks have closed for various reasons. So that's a compelling argument certainly. And the other compelling argument that I see has to do with the drainage and the removal from the Bonne Femme Creek idea. And we are always seeking to improve the sewage capacity in terms of closing down some of these lagoons and so on. So from those two perspectives, I certainly am inclined to take the Staff recommendation and recommend approval of this proposal.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Vander Tuig?

MR. VANDER TUIG: Well, I agree that the mobile home looks like a nice development. I do have concerns, and I'll kind of address stormwater. I mean, this is -- this is, you know, the Bonne

Femme watershed, and I kind of view this as a major stepping stone into very much increased development in that watershed. And maybe that's more of an annexation question than a land-use question. But we were just talking about the -- you know, the urban service boundary and that sort of thing in our discussion about the Comprehensive Plan. And it seems to me that it's staring us in the face right now, you know, as to what decisions we make here with this one, so -- and the other kind of concerning thing I have is that the tax -- you know, the taxpayer is going to be paying for the infrastructure that's put in place here. And while you could argue that there's going to be, eventually, enough tax base here to pay that back, I did -- I was part of the design of the lift station at Discovery Ridge, and it really was just sized to accommodate the future growth of Discovery Ridge. So ultimately, as new development occurs out there, we'll see it'll just be a chain effect where, you know, this infrastructure will have to be upgraded and upgraded and so that's a big -- that's a big piece -- you know, chunk to chew here as far as the decision regarding this development. The development itself looks fine. It's just maybe particularly the location on the outskirts of the city, so I'll be curious to see what other Commissioners think about that.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Reichlin?

MR. REICHLIN: I'm going to preface my comments with a confession: I didn't ever really think I'd take a position regarding a gateway to Columbia, but I'm prepared to do one this evening. Back 46 years ago, Highway 63 was a two-lane thoroughfare to go from Jeff City to Columbia to Moberly. And a lot of the areas that we have mobile home parks in now are a throwback to that era. As heartwarming as this story may be regarding the family's ownership and such like that, it's hard for me to envision that going forward 10, 15, 25 years that -- I'll quote/unquote it as a legitimized in the city RMH zoning, is going to be a positive effect on potential growth in the area. And as a result I find it -- although, as much as I am in support of affordable housing, I'm not going to be able to support this development.

MR. WHEELER: No one wants to speak?

MR. STRODTMAN: I'll go next.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Strodtman, thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: I plan on supporting the project. I'll echo a couple of points spoken earlier. You know, the -- obviously getting it off the watershed, getting it into the city sewer is important and the distance and obviously the developer paying for that infrastructure cost 100 percent are important. And I'll just echo the affordability of this housing type. I'm not for sure -- I mean, obviously not every-- this isn't going to fit everywhere, work everywhere, but I think it works well here and I think it's an appropriate use, so I plan on supporting it.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: I really don't have anything to say other than I'm just going to echo Mr. Skala and Mr. Reichlin's comments. I think it's -- works for Columbia and I'm going to support it.

MS. PETERS: I think it's a delicate balance. I do agree that this is pushing the boundary and I think that's a tough issue as far as future growth for Columbia. I think affordable housing though is very

important. Getting the lagoon out of production and into something of a main line sewer I believe is important. I do have a little bit of a concern about stormwater management coming off the future site, but from what I read, Staff feels comfortable with that. So I will be going with Staff's recommendation, although I totally understand the gateway to Columbia.

MR. WHEELER: Dr. Puri?

DR. PURI: I think that the location where it is, I think it works. I understand what Mr. Reichlin is trying to convey. And I think at the point where it is, I think it's okay and it's a clean facility and well-maintained. And I think it's better to channelize this sewage system rather than into lagoons. Eventually that will be a problem. So I'll support this.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. My comment: The Overtons run a tight ship on these -- on their courts. I've been through a number of them and they do run a nice facility. I personally don't think -- in the eight years that I've been here, we've never, to my knowledge, went -- or had someone request RMH zoning. We have on a number of occasions had someone want to go the other way with multi-family, and I would be willing to predict that at some point this one will as well. And because of that I think I'm actually more comfortable, although I don't want to see it taken out because affordable housing is a huge issue in Columbia. But I would predict at some point it probably would be, and because of that I'm probably more inclined to support it because multi-family right long side of the highway would seem to be fairly appropriate as far as a gateway to the city. Although, I, too, understand what you're saying there. So I'm supportive of this. I definitely get what Mr. Vander Tuig is saying about pushing our southern boundary. It's interesting that in our conversations on that East Area Plan, this is below what we were talking about, so this -- or to the south of what we were talking about, so here we are already exceeding that limit. And I wonder if it would fit into what Staff is characterizing as an urban service boundary as well. I have a feeling it's south of the line they've drawn for our new plan. However, that said, I do think it's important to get rid of the lagoons. I suspect that there's an issue there or we wouldn't be addressing it now. And as far as the variance requests, it does seem to me that we're -- especially when it come to screening, there's not a great deal to screen it from. So I think we will need to handle this -- unless there's additional comments, we will need to handle this zoning and then the plan and if we're going to support the variances. Am I correct, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: The plan and the variances can be handled together.

MR. WHEELER: Right. Yeah. Mr. Skala?

MR. SKALA: I just had a kind of a question of Staff. One of the comments that was made is kind of provocative, and that is that the RMH zoning designation has essentially a tighter restrictive format than some of the others. And perhaps, I guess, as we go along in this process, we may address that at some point when we take up some of these rezoning questions. But do you have any idea what the reason for that or the source or that's just the way it's been or is there some -- do you have any insight into that, why that's different?

MR. MACINTYRE: Well, I don't have any direct -- certainly I wasn't here when it was written --

MR. SKALA: Yeah.

MR. MACINTYRE: -- and I --

MR. SKALA: Most of us weren't.

MR. MACINTYRE: -- haven't spoken to anyone involved with it directly. However, the suggestion was made to me by I believe another staff member that it may have been one of those situations where at the time the idea was perhaps to try to discourage this type of use in some cases. And this is purely speculation, however, that might be the case with regard to --

MR. SKALA: Interesting.

MR. WHEELER: He said that a little nicer than I would've. All right. Someone want to take a stab at a motion here or any further discussion? Please. Ms. Peters.

MS. PETERS: I would make a motion to recommend approval of Case 13-29, Doris Overton Trust permanent zoning. Recommendation would be to follow Staff's recommendations of approval for residential manufactured housing as permanent City zoning and approval of the proposed preliminary -- yeah?

MR. WHEELER: And then we'll do --

MS. PETERS: Okay.

MR. WHEELER: We need to handle it in two, so --

MS. PETERS: Okay.

MR. WHEELER: So you're recommending approval of the zoning request?

MS. PETERS: Yep.

MR. WHEELER: Is there -- Mr. Strodtman?

MR. STRODTMAN: (Indicating.)

MR. WHEELER: Motion's been made and seconded. Discussion on the motion? When you're ready.

MR. VANDER TUIG: We have a motion and a second for approval of Case 13-29 to annex 26.4 acres of land into the City of Columbia, and to assign RMH (Residential Manufactured Home) as permanent City zoning. And that is with the variances a well, per City Staff or --

MR. WHEELER: We're going to handle the zoning separately and then we'll do the plan and --

MR. VANDER TUIG: Variances after.

MR. WHEELER: So we're just doing the zoning.

MR. VANDER TUIG: Oh. Variances are relative to the plan. Correct? Okay. All right. Very well.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Peters, Dr. Puri, Mr. Skala, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Wheeler. Voting No: Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Vander Tuig. Motion carries 6-2.

MR. WHEELER: All right. So I cut you off. Would you like to

MS. PETERS: Would move for approval of Case 13-29, Doris Overton Trust, preliminary [sic] zoning, approval of a preliminary Residential Manufactured Housing plan and all requested variances.

MR. TILLOTSON: (Indicating.)

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson. Motion is made and seconded. Discussion on the motion? When you're ready.

MR. VANDER TUIG: We have a motion and a second for the second part of Case 13-29 for the approval of a preliminary RMH development plan including the variances per the Staff's report and their recommendations.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Peters, Dr. Puri, Mr. Skala, Mr. Strodman, Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Wheeler. Voting No: Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Vander Tuig. Motion carries 6-2.

MR. WHEELER: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

13-36 A request by Missouri Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church (owner) for approval of a major amendment to the Missouri Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church O-P Plan. The subject site contains 4.49 acres of land located on the north side of Amron Court, and is addressed 3601 Amron Court.

MR. WHEELER: May we have a Staff report, please.
Staff report was given by Mr. Steve MacIntyre of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed O-P development plan amendment and accompanying design parameters.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any questions of Staff? Dr. Puri?

DR. PURI: Question on parking, how the parking is calculated. I guess if it's one parking per five seats or is that --

MR. MACINTYRE: I think we, if I'm not mistaken, calculated the parking based on the square footage, because that's a higher intensity use than the assembly use would be, I believe. So it's -- and it's actually a mixture of uses that they -- they want to have some flexibility in that building to accommodate not only storage or assembly space, but also some classrooms. So I think it's going to be a flexible floorplan; however, I'll let the applicant weigh in on that. And on the parking I can certainly look up the calculations, how they were --

DR. PURI: I think that's on the plan. It says one space per five seats --

MR. MACINTYRE: Oh, yeah, so pardon me.

DR. PURI: -- area. Then, I mean, it seems --

MR. MACINTYRE: You're correct.

DR. PURI: -- shallow on parking. I don't know. I mean, I thought you guys would've gone over that with --

MR. MACINTYRE: You're correct. They did break it down there. I'd forgotten. So it is all designated out with 100-seat assembly area and 150-seat proposed. So they have broken it out

into -- for the new building, the office area as well as the assembly area. And it does -- it does meet our requirements.

MR. SKALA: So --

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Skala?

MR. SKALA: Yeah. So presumably that is covered by the mixed-use aspect of the -- in the flexibility that they have in terms of the use of that building. Is that --

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. It --

MR. SKALA: That's how it was calc-- I mean, that's what the Staff has based its recommendations on?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. They've -- since they've called out specifically -- oftentimes what they'll do is just go with the highest potential use that's permitted on -- in a building and use that as a basis for calculating the parking requirements. In this case they have called out specifically how much square footage is going to be used for what, so that's the model they've followed here for parking. It does comply.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any other questions of Staff? Seeing none, we'll open the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. SANDER: Good evening. I'm Chris Sander with A Civil Group; our office is at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. We -- the existing facility has -- is primarily office. There is a meeting room space that doesn't specifically fit into the parking calculations very well. As we looked at how to calculate parking -- well, I guess I should first say that the additional spaces being added will be very similar in that there is some dedicated office space that will be, you know, broken up into what would be used as office. And so that fits very well with the City's requirement of one for 300 square feet. The additional space that would be kind of multipurpose, you know, we could have said was all storage and then it would be -- we'd need, like, three spaces for the entire large area. But that -- they periodically have members of various churches that would be coming to this facility for some sort of a training exercise or further learning in their faith. So we wanted to make sure that when they bring people in to use their facility there's adequate parking. And that's where we -- that's why we have broken it up this way into the areas that are dedicated for office, to provide the one for 300, but the open spaces that may be used for a large gathering or a training of some sort would -- we've used the assemble kind of designation of one per five, similar to what a church would be, one for five seats. The Conference is very focused on native vegetation and the landscape that they've got out there, they're very proud of the use of native vegetation throughout the site. A lot of the stormwater features that would be required by our ordinance now are even -- they actually have designed in excess of what the ordinance would require today -- was done on this site before those requirements were in place. And that was just part of the church's -- the Conference's desire to be good stewards of their property. We intend to landscape the additional area around the -- including some stormwater area in the north

corner of the tract as well as the construction of the trail, which -- or path that would be -- they hope to possibly include maybe some exercise stations and make it available to the neighbors and to anybody who's interested to come enjoy the wildlife that is attracted by the native vegetation. I don't really have anything else. If you've got any questions, I'll try to answer it. I've got Kendall and Jeff from the conference here that can answer any questions as well.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any questions of this speaker? Dr. Puri?

DR. PURI: Will these people be driving here for training and then -- you know, just for training. I mean, obviously, if you have 200 people that are going to be in that space -- I mean, I know you show future parking on there. There's that cul-de-sac area. I mean, do you think people that are driving in will have ample space with only 50 spaces?

MR. SANDER: We do. There are actually 66 spaces already on the site and we're going to add 38 -- excuse me -- 39 spaces, 5 that would be ADA compliant. So that gives us a total of 110 parking -- vehicle parking spaces with the 12 bicycle spaces in addition to that. We feel like if adequate parking is not provided, this facility is not functional. And this isn't an out-of-town landlord that's looking to just throw it up and rent it out. The Church is very invested in this facility and intends to use it for a long period of time. The future parking that's shown would -- as needed, can be expanded to reach that 110 parking spaces.

MR. WHEELER: And I assume the trigger would be the additional need or blocking the street?

MR. SANDER: Yeah. If -- if the facility's not functioning properly, then it becomes necessary to add additional parking.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Skala?

MR. SKALA: We -- we -- in the past we have occasionally faced this -- this parking issue, I think, and sometimes we've set some -- some place aside in the event of expansion, if it became necessary. That's not the case right here, but actually I'm inclined to be a little bit conservative on the parking site here until the need is demonstrated, and then, of course, you'll have to do something about it.

MR. WHEELER: Is this sidewalk along Mexico Gravel, does that connect up to the bridge over 63?

MR. SANDER: It does not.

MR. WHEELER: Is there any plan to connect it that you're aware of?

MR. SANDER: My understanding from Staff was that likely the sidewalk -- Mexico Gravel Bridge would be significantly higher in elevation --

MR. WHEELER: Oh, yeah.

MR. SANDER: -- above this sidewalk. And the intention would be that the sidewalk pass under the bridge and continue across on the north side of Mexico Gravel, so along -- parallel to 63, under the bridge is kind of the thought process for that.

MR. WHEELER: And go up 63?

MR. SANDER: Parallel to 63 under the bridge and then turn and go back on Brown School -- Brown Station -- Mexico Gravel. One of those roads.

MR. WHEELER: Man, you have me confused. Okay. I think I understand now. Okay. So basically, in order to -- for a pedestrian to get across that bridge, they're going to have to go up and get on the street.

MR. SANDER: Yes.

MR. WHEELER: Thanks for being frank. I just wanted to -- we're about to do CIP, so we're talking about that. Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: Just a real minor little question was, on this Amron Court, sidewalk comes in and kind of stops on both sides. It doesn't go all the way around the little cul-de-sac, but you're going to develop that. Are you going to connect that sidewalk, bring it on around?

MR. SANDER: Yeah. As the existing sidewalk comes down to about where the proposed driveway comes off, right off the end of the cul-de-sac. And we would be extending that to the south property line along the frontage of this lot.

MR. WHEELER: All right. Are there any additional questions of this speaker? Thank you, sir.

MR. SANDER: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any additional speakers?

MR. WALLER: Good evening. My name is Kendall Waller; I serve as Director of Financial Administrative Ministries for Missouri Annual Conference and so would be one of the occupants of the building.

MR. WHEELER: If you will, give me an address, please.

MR. WALLER: That would be 3601 Amron Court there. And thank you. I've never addressed a body like this before, and if you're like any other, I know it's eight o'clock, we need to get done. We just say briefly, we used to rent office space in several locations around the state and when we were able to build this building, we brought all of those offices together but two, which currently also rent space. This addition just allows us to get all of our offices under one roof. One of the things that we learned when we did that, we hadn't anticipated the ability to do teaching events because all we had was office space. And so we added a couple of rooms on this that give us a little bit of flexible space and now there's demand for more of that. Around parking, many of the people that would attend that event come as groups in vans. And so it's really high-occupancy vehicle kind of transportation. That may or may not help in the conversation around parking, but that would be a part of it. And lastly, we've mentioned storage a couple of times, but one of our primary works across the state is to be a first responder in disaster response. We have coordinators in almost every county in the state as well as most cities and we work with those. And so this allows us to take in supplies and get them out in a very quick manner, and that's one of the reasons we needed just some additional storage space, allows us to do that. So that's all I had to share. I hope that's helpful to you.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any questions of this speaker? Thank you, sir.

MR. WALLER: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any other speakers? Seeing none, we'll close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. SKALA: Don't look at me.

MR. WHEELER: Dr. Puri?

DR. PURI: I think it's a good project. I just had concern about parking. Whenever you have assembly or teaching going on, do you have adequate -- you know, as long as people aren't parking in that cul-de-sac eventually, this future parking there, that was the only concern. I think the building is nicely done, the existing building; I'm sure the new addition will be nicely done also. With that said, I mean, just, you know, when you have assembly of 250 people and only, you know, 50 spaces, it sort of triggers that, you know, alarm that are you going to park on the street. And, you know, that's not something that people across from that would want and so forth. So that's my only concern. If the parking -- the rest of the commissioners see how they feel about that.

MR. SKALA: Well, I agree with what -- mostly what Dr. Puri has to say in terms of the development itself. I think, actually the parking number is somewhere closer to 100. But I'm inclined to endorse this plan because I'm reluctant to overpark -- to -- to provide too much impervious surface and so on, and I think it's adequate for, as I understand, the uses for this particular development. So I'm inclined to support this.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: I kind of go along with that. The parking was a bit of a concern, but I think they've addressed those issues very well. And having grown up in a very religious family and being drug off to training and lessons and learning, we usually piled in a van many times, so I can relate to that. I intend to support it.

MR. WHEELER: Well, I'll hop in here. I share the concerns. I think it's a good plan. I would've -- I don't really think it's the applicant's responsibility, but it would be nice to see a sidewalk across the new bridge. Just saying. But I do think that -- you know, and I'm curious and maybe Staff can answer this question. Is there some mechanism by which if parking becomes an issue here and this cul-de-sac's blocked all the time, would the City have any power to encourage the additional impervious surface? And I do agree with Mr. Skala on this. If we can keep it open, it's better for the watershed. But I also agree that if parking becomes an issue, that we need to have some mechanism by which we could maybe kick that into gear, for lack of a more eloquent term, because apparently it's late and I can't think.

MR. MACINTYRE: Beyond -- beyond our standard requirements for parking based on the uses identified, I suppose if there was a violation of cars being parked on the street for over 24 hours without moving, the police could get involved. Or if there was some overparking that was blocking adjoining driveways or affecting other property owners in the area, that could certainly trigger police involvement,

and it's an enforcement issue. However, I don't think that we could directly through our codes, through zoning at least, require them to come back and install additional parking.

MR. WHEELER: So based on the calculations you've done now or to this point, 39 spaces complies with the rules. Is that what you're saying? Is that what I hear you saying?

MR. MACINTYRE: Well, the number of spaces on here, shown on the plan, does comply with the required number of spaces, given the uses identified. And the breakdown is a bit confusing, but they've broken it down showing existing and proposed for both structures, the existing building and the future, and how they're broken down -- how the space is broken down within each of those, existing and proposed, structures. It's a little bit tricky to say, but I have gone through this, I assure you, with a fine-tooth comb and made sure that it does comply with our requirements upon my initial review.

MR. WHEELER: So if you don't mind, was that a yes or a no?

MR. MACINTYRE: Oh, yeah. It's a yes.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. All right. Mr. Skala?

MR. SKALA: Just one other thing: It's my understanding, once this recommendation goes and gets before the City Council and they make a decision and so on, there is no compliance mechanism. However, public safety or nuisances, that kind of thing may trigger something. And with regard to that sidewalk business, I mean, I just want to say for the record that that Mexico Gravel improvement started on my watch while I was still in City Council, so this is the kind of thing where things happen after, these improvements, and it's very kind of difficult to fit them in. But I understand your concern. It would be nice to be able to connect this to the new construction.

MR. WHEELER: Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: I have a quick question of Staff.

MR. MACINTYRE: I'll try to provide a quick answer.

MS. PETERS: It is related to parking. In the event that they are a bit short, are we talking ten parking spaces?

MR. MACINTYRE: Short?

MS. PETERS: Yeah. Although, you say it's compliant. But there's a question of parking, of whether or not there will be overflow and whether or not they're compliant. And my understanding is, yes, they're compliant; is that correct?

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. Yes.

MS. PETERS: Okay.

MR. MACINTYRE: This plan does meet the required parking. It looks like the engineer might be ready to step in and answer any detailed -- more detailed questions on the parking. I'm just noticing him there.

MS. PETERS: If he would like to comment, I don't --

MR. WHEELER: I think Mr. Vander Tuig's got a --

MR. VANDER TUIG: Oh, no. I actually have a question for him.

MS. PETERS: Oh, for him. Okay.

MR. VANDER TUIG: Go ahead.

MS. PETERS: I'll finish my comments later.

MR. VANDER TUIG: No. Go ahead.

MS. PETERS: No. I'm good. Go ahead.

MR. VANDER TUIG: Okay. I was just curious whether -- you know, you had mentioned some of the natural grasses and stuff they have there. Did you consider, out of curiosity, grass pave or anything, you know, that would be not impervious, but would serve the purpose if you were to get a lot of customers?

MR. SANDER: Well, I think maybe we did not really consider -- we considered grass pavers, but they are -- tend to be some maintenance trouble and so we didn't particularly head that direction. One thing that I think -- I want to make sure is clear that -- that the combination of the existing parking lot, which has 69 spaces, and the additional parking that is shown to be constructed with this plan, we'll have 110 parking spaces total. There are -- I'd have to count them here, but the future parking that's shown is in addition to that 110. So we're showing a 150-seat capacity if all of the meeting room, training rooms were full at the same time. It's not one large auditorium with 250 seats. It's broken into multiple spaces. But if everything was at capacity, there's 250 seats total, and we have 110 parking spaces for that. And so slightly over two people per vehicle to -- for attending these activities is not -- doesn't -- it doesn't seem to be out of line.

MR. VANDER TUIG: I think you've answered my question and addressed some of the concerns.

MR. WHEELER: Ms. Peters, do you want to --

MS. PETERS: No. I'm good. I just wanted to finish my comments.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SANDER: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: There's no addition questions of this speaker? All right. Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: I'll start with what the top of my list, the sidewalk, the sidewalk to nowhere. Could we possibly put that on this CIP comments that we're going to have at our next meeting, a question to Public Works?

MR. ZENNER: You're talking the sidewalk along Mexico Gravel Road?

MS. PETERS: Right.

MR. WHEELER: Bridge.

MR. ZENNER: That will be constructed as part of this or the sidewalk that's already there?

MS. PETERS: How we get it connected so that it functions as a public sidewalk for citizens. My next comment would be, there is a church across the way from here where if they, for some reason, had some major event, I'm sure that they could borrow parking from a church. So I don't see the parking as an issue. Not only did Staff indicate that it was okay, but in the event if they had something,

there's other parking spots. I know that many of these people occasionally, when they come to these things, stay in nearby hotels and take shuttle services to these functions. That's pretty much all I have. I intend to support this. I don't know if there's more comments coming. I'll wait to make a motion. I would like to make a motion for approval of Case 13-36, Missouri Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church O-P development plan major amendment --

MR. SKALA: Second.

MS. PETERS: -- amendment -- I'm sorry. Go ahead. Associated with design parameters.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you.

MS. PETERS: You're welcome.

MR. SKALA: Second.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Skala. Motion's been made and seconded. Discussion on the motion?

MR. VANDER TUIG: Okay. We have a motion and a second on Case 13-36 for approval of a major amendment to the Missouri Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church O-P Plan, including the associated design parameters.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Peters, Dr. Puri, Mr. Reichlin, Mr. Skala, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson, Mr. Vander Tuig, Mr. Wheeler. Motion carries 8-0.

MR. WHEELER: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.

VI.) COMMENTS OF PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

VII.) COMMENTS OF STAFF

MR. ZENNER: Your next meeting will be on April 18th, two weeks from today, same time, same place. We should, however, be downstairs in 1B, where our normal meeting room is for our work session, so come join us. Then you have a meeting on May 9th, again, regularly scheduled meeting with some relatively significant work agenda items -- we'll be back in 1B again -- and our regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. We do have some upcoming items, and you will notice there are some things in red. You know, we are trying to shorten the workload and the burden for our Commissioners. Two items that were going to be on the 18th's agenda have been withdrawn by the applicant. One being the Anthony Place Subdivision; this is in the East Campus neighborhood. It has been withdrawn as well as the Woodrail Country Homes PUD amendment off of Woodrail Avenue; it has been. We do have two subdivision plats then and we have an annexation and permanent zoning off of Old Plank Road. Your maps, as you see before you, Kelly's Addition. This is a subdivision plat doing some combination of some lots. And we have our Landmark Subdivision plat. This is basically a replat of that larger tract of land, will be creating a couple of individualized lots out of this particular parcel. And then the Woodrail Country Homes PUD being withdrawn. And finally, our annexation and permanent zoning request off of Old Plank Road. This is basically bringing in the current county RS property into the city as R-1 for the purposes of being able to connect to city sanitary sewer. Those are the items for the upcoming 18th's

Planning and Zoning Commission agenda. As we discussed this evening within our work session, we will be discussing the Capital Improvement Program and have with us special guests from our Public Works Department as well as Parks and Recreation. If you do have additional comments or questions that you would like us to ask those staff members, please forward them to our attention here in the course of the next week and we will make sure that they are forwarded to the right individuals. We also will be completing the engagement of -- review of the draft, Columbia Imagined Comprehensive Plan. If you do have any additional questions or written comments, please forward them to my attention or Rachel Bacon's and we will be able to address those at the April 18th meeting. Thank you for your participation this evening. It is wonderful to be able to bring a larger project like the Comprehensive Plan to a close, and look forward to getting the rest of your comments at the 18th. Do you have anything else?

VIII.) COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

MR. WHEELER: Ms. Peters?

MS. PETERS: Very quickly, would it be possible to schedule some time during a work session to talk a bit about the Smart Growth Conference that a number of us went to?

MR. ZENNER: If it would please the Commission, I would like to go ahead and try to have that the first meeting in May, if we can. I will make a note of that to ensure that it is on the agenda that first meeting. If we are complete with the plan, will allow us an opportunity to spend a significant amount of time, along with potentially the presentation on the ADU ordinance also that has been asked of the Commission to review. And those will be the two items that first meeting in May.

MS. PETERS: Okay. That would be great. I also have a couple of business cards that I would like to get into the Staff's hands. They relate to grant funding for the Black Archives in Kansas City, and I believe it's going to relate to some of the requests that we've had for Blind Boone's home and a bit of the movement for Black Heritage here in Columbia. This would be an asset, I think, that they could use. And as it did come from Smart Growth, I'd like to have Staff take charge of it.

MR. ZENNER: We'll be more than happy to accept those and provide them to the right staff person that deals with our grants and neighborhood engagement.

MS. PETERS: Thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Skala?

MR. SKALA: Just an announcement: As a result of the recent municipal election in the Third Ward, I was advised by the City Clerk that I will have to turn in my resignation to this august body. It's really been a pleasure. I will be sworn in on the City Council on the 8th, so I'll -- I will send you a letter to that effect before the 8th. Like I said, it's been a pleasure, folks. I really enjoyed it in my brief tenure this time around, so thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Vander Tuig?

MR. VANDER TUIG: Yeah. I just wanted to bring up the issue of lagoons a little bit. I think this is going to be something that's going to continue to come forward to us on the outskirts of town

because of new regulations that I'm aware of as, like Mr. Sayre said, permits come up and are coming due. There are other options to tying into city sewer. There is mechanical package plants as an option to meet the affluent limits. And so that should be something to consider, I think, as we determine the urban service boundary. I just wanted to mention that.

MS. PETERS: If I could follow up on that, I appreciate you bringing that up. If we might possibly have that put on work session to educate commissioners, I would greatly appreciate that. One of the things that I look at on what we voted on tonight was -- my only understanding was either they tied into a sewer line or it was a lagoon. And if a lagoon wasn't an option, then those homes were going to have to move.

MR. VANDER TUIG: I maybe should've brought it up earlier.

MS. PETERS: Yeah. But now that I'm aware of it, I would definitely like to know more about what's going on if we could possibly get that on a work session. And to do a follow-up on that, I know that people say that once one thing is in, well, then, of course, we can have something next door. And I don't agree with that. Even though this may be over the service boundary now, it doesn't mean that the door is open, in my opinion.

MR. WHEELER: Mr. Reichlin?

MR. REICHLIN: I'm good.

MR. WHEELER: Oh. I thought you were putting your hand up.

MR. REICHLIN: No.

MR. WHEELER: Are there any other comments of Commissioners? May I say congratulations, Mr. Skala. We look forward to you serving at the next level and we appreciate you serving the City. To all our viewers out there, I'd like to say that we are reviewing the Comprehensive Plan right now as a P and Z Commission, and we expect to have this out for public engagement on this final plan sometime, hopefully, in May. And so it's online; please review it and come out and participate in the process. With that, we'll adjourn.

IX.) ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

(Off the record.)

Matthew Vander Tuig – Secretary

Doug Wheeler - Chair