

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MAY 22, 2014

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

**Dr. Ray Puri
Mr. Rusty Strodman
Mr. Doug Wheeler
Mr. Bill Tillotson
Mr. Andy Lee
Ms. Sara Loe
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Ms. Tootie Burns**

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Mr. Steve Reichlin

I) CALL TO ORDER

DR. PURI: Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting for May 22, 2014 will come to order please.
May we have roll call.

II) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

DR. PURI: Staff, any changes in the agenda?

MR. ZENNER: No.

DR. PURI: Okay. Agenda approved? Thumbs up?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

III) APPROVAL OF REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

• May 8, 2014

DR. PURI: Approval of regular meeting minutes for May 8, 2014? Commissioners?

MS. BURNS: I move for approval of the minutes.

DR. PURI: Ms. Burns moves.

MS. LOE: Second.

DR. PURI: Ms. Loe seconds. Thumbs up?

IV) SUBDIVISIONS

Case No. 14-49

A request by Phoenix Property Development, LLC (owner) for a five-lot subdivision plat of R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling District) zoned land to be known as “JoAnn Subdivision Plat 1.” The 1.4- acre subject site is located on the northeast corner of JoAnn Street and Mills Drive, and contains two existing single-family homes addressed 1509 and 1511 Mills Drive.

DR. PURI: 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 plat.

DR. PURI: Commissioners, any questions of the staff. Mr. Strodman?

MR. STRODTMAN: Are there any other duplexes in the neighborhood? I didn't really see a lot of them when I --

MR. MACINTYRE: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: -- drove the neighborhood.

MR. MACINTYRE: Actually, you can kind of make out --

MR. STRODTMAN: There are some in the back?

MR. MACINTYRE: -- roughly to the north, I believe that's a duplex. This property on the west side of JoAnn Street is a duplex, as well. And then the property beneath it, I believe, is a single-family home, and as well as, I think, the corner lot on the northwest corner of Mills and JoAnn. So it's a bit of a mix. There are several duplexes, though, more to the north and west.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

DR. PURI: Any other questions, Commissioners?

MR. TILLOTSON: Well, I do have a little question here.

DR. PURI: Yes, Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: The existing house that's going to stay, that's the one on the --

MR. MACINTYRE: Directly on the corner.

MR. TILLOTSON: Oh.

MR. MACINTYRE: I'm sorry. It's hard to make it out in this. It's got good tree canopy around it, but just in behind the trees there.

MR. TILLOTSON: So then behind those trees, the access to that house from the roadway is --

MR. MACINTYRE: Yes. It's currently got access from Mills. That's a shared -- I believe it's a shared driveway, but then the other side also has its own driveway. That may be shown on the plat here. No. I think there was -- there's a note on the plat that indicates any future development. So lots 4 and 5 would have -- make use of a shared access, so a single driveway would serve both of those lots to help mitigate, you know, adding more driveway entrances onto Mills.

MR. TILLOTSON: Okay. And those are paved driveways?

MR. MACINTYRE: The existing driveways are not paved on the --

MR. TILLOTSON: But they would have to be when it's developed?

MR. MACINTYRE: Only if there were permits pulled or if they wanted to add onto the home, for example, or do something to enhance the property substantially. I believe that would be the trigger where they may be required to pave the driveway.

MR. TILLOTSON: But that can't be a requirement as part of the replatting?

MR. MACINTYRE: No. Conditions aren't typically associated like that with the -- with the platting process.

DR. PURI: Commissioners, a motion or -- Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: Yeah. I would make a motion to approve Case Number 14-49 as recommended by the City.

MR. STANTON: Second.

DR. PURI: Mr. Stanton seconds. May we have roll call, please.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, sir.

Roll Call Vote (Voting “yes” is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Wheeler, Ms. Burns, Mr. Lee, Ms. Loe, Dr. Puri, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson. Motion carries 8-0.

MR. STRODTMAN: The motion will carry to City Council.

Case No. 14-66

A request by David Butcher (Agent) on behalf of BS Properties (owners) for approval of a replat of C-3 (General Business District) zoned property, to be known as “Farley's Plat No. 4.” The 2.18-acre subject site is located on the west side of West Sexton Road, approximately 150 feet north of Mikel Street, and commonly known as 7080 West Sexton Road.

DR. PURI: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the final replat.

DR. PURI: Commissioners, any questions of the staff? Seeing none. Motion? Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: I make a motion to approve Case 14-66.

MR. STANTON: Second.

DR. PURI: Mr. Stanton second. May we have a roll call, please?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Mr. Chair.

Roll Call Vote (Voting “yes” is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Wheeler, Ms. Burns, Mr. Lee, Ms. Loe, Dr. Puri, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson. Motion carries 8-0.

MR. STRODTMAN: The motion carries.

DR. PURI: Thank you.

V) PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. 14-48

A request by the City of Columbia to amend Chapter 29, Sections 29-15 (District C-2 Central Business District); and Section 29-30 (Parking and Loading) to (1) add a first floor non-residential use requirement in the C-2 Zoning District; (2) add residential parking requirement in the C-2 District; and (3) add a “tall structure” approval procedure in the C-2 District. (This item was tabled at the April 24 Commission meeting.)

DR. PURI: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Tim Teddy of the Planning and Development Department. No staff recommendation was given.

DR. PURI: Commissioners, any questions of the staff? Mr. Wheeler?

MR. WHEELER: Yes. Could you go back to that tall structure? There was, like, a list of five items.

MR. TEDDY: Do you want the original list here?

MR. WHEELER: That's -- that's -- no. That's good, right there.

MR. TEDDY: That's good? Okay.

MR. WHEELER: Yeah. That one. So just so I get it -- kind of a clear picture, on the additional height, will not have adverse impacts, second one from the bottom. Do you think -- your opinion -- that the ten-story city parking garage across from the post office adversely affects the post office?

MR. TEDDY: You know, I -- you know, you might get a different answer if you ask a postman, but -- and we did hear comments from another side of that block when the building was going up. But as this standard is written, it's really -- you know, the penetration of natural light -- I think that might be the better term -- just getting more shade probably not sufficient to fail that one, but yeah. You -- I think your point is you -- when you get that difference in scale of buildings --

MR. WHEELER: Well --

MR. TEDDY: -- you might have people that howl about the size of the building going up across the street.

MR. WHEELER: Well, this --

MR. TEDDY: This is more aimed at something --

MR. WHEELER: Right.

MR. TEDDY: -- that needs -- absolutely needs to have light and you can show that it's in the dark now and that's going to create some problems.

MR. WHEELER: Okay.

MR. TEDDY: There's going to be a value impact on it.

MR. WHEELER: What about the Short Street Garage? Do you think that adversely affects the properties to the north of it?

MR. TEDDY: To the north of it?

MR. WHEELER: Yes. Across the street -- across Walnut?

MR. TEDDY: I would not say that. It's -- you know, again, it's very striking in its scale, you know, and we've got a lot of that now. We've seen a lot of juxtapositions of buildings, but I don't think that's what's intended here is to --

MR. WHEELER: Well, I guess my real point is that there's additional explanation required for us to know what this says, you know --

MR. TEDDY: Right.

MR. WHEELER: -- and that's really where I'm going with that.

MR. TEDDY: Right. Right.

MR. WHEELER: All right.

MR. TEDDY: Right.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you.

DR. PURI: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: If I can follow up on Doug's comment, just as far as a concern about clarification, this

point identifies light to adjacent buildings and public streets, and you have added language that helps define the penetration of some light to these openings or rooftop spaces. But, frankly, that doesn't do anything for my further understanding of how I would evaluate the impact of availability of air and light to the public street.

MR. TEDDY: Uh-huh. Yeah. Because it's -- the additional language doesn't even talk about streets.

MS. LOE: No, it does not.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. I think that's a fair criticism.

DR. PURI: Mr. Strodtman?

MR. STRODTMAN: I just have a couple questions. Going through a lot of the comments that we received on this from the citizens, I just have a couple of questions related to those comments. I saw over and over the conversation about a sunset date. I don't think I ever saw any reference, any kind of a sunset date, so the interim definition by that is maybe not the right word, in the interim?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. Yeah. The comment is -- CID letter, for example, requests that there be a December 2015 sunset date, and that's something that could be done. The City has done interim ordinances before. Probably the only thing I would add is I assume December is chosen because that's what we have announced as the target date for delivering a new development code, so it gets replaced with something else at that point. We're behind schedule --

MR. STRODTMAN: I mean, if the date could be changed to a clarion --

MR. TEDDY: If we're behind schedule, you might want to say sunset is this month of this year, but it could be renewed, you know. That's the usual solution. If there's going to be gap between what comes after, you -- you maybe renew it for a shorter period.

MR. STRODTMAN: The hard date may be unrealistic.

MR. TEDDY: Now, that's going to be maddening for people that are planning projects, but you would -- what we don't know now when we draft that is what's the alternative going to look like. Is it going to be completely different or --

MR. STRODTMAN: Right. Right. Okay. Another one that I saw over -- a couple different times is -- and I'm kind of on the same thing -- is notification of property owners. Obviously, these are -- this is a pretty major change that we're recommending. Would we make some kind of a notification to these C owners -- these C-2 owners, so that they would know and maybe even give them time to react, and maybe that's not --

MR. TEDDY: I think it's a very reasonable suggestion. We -- we'd probably get a better payoff if we have some discussion of what further revisions need to be made, whether they're for clarity or maybe even something substantive. So at that time we give the notice, we can say, well, here's the -- maybe it's the draft that you all want input on, and then we give them a time -- time and place to come and give input to us rather than -- if we're going to go to all the trouble of notifying each and every owner in the district, we probably ought to give them a forum then to attend rather than just say, here, you can access it online --

MR. STRODTMAN: Done. Right. Yeah.

MR. TEDDY: -- and, you know, send me a note with your thoughts.

MR. STRODTMAN: And then your -- and then your definition of projects that are already in the works, for lack of a better description, is with the building permit issue; correct? So that would be if you have a building permit issue, then you're in the work -- you're in the pipeline and anything before that would -- this would apply to? Is that kind of your --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. There's going to have to be a clean break at some point, so if something has been reviewed under one set of rules and we've gotten to the point where we're approving it, yeah. The ordinance could be written to say that as long as it has a permit and the date it's approved, no --

MR. STRODTMAN: But you're saying that a permit would have to be required as opposed to a first plan review?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. Because it's going to be a little bit -- it gets a little murkier, you know. You might get incomplete plan submittals and this kind of thing. It could be done, but you would want to be very precise as to what constitutes a plan submittal and then what -- is there fairly diligent follow-up to get the thing done from that point.

MR. STRODTMAN: On both parties' behalf, yes.

MR. TEDDY: Right. On both parties' behalf.

MR. STRODTMAN: Right.

MR. TEDDY: Now, realistically, what happens in these moments is if Council is about to approve something and someone is aware of it, they've got a project that's 90 percent through the approval process, I'm sure they'll make it known and --

MR. STRODTMAN: Be an exception.

MR. TEDDY: -- we'll cross the bridge when we get to it. I'm in favor of anything that we've reviewed and said it's okay, to let it proceed to the finish line without -- you know, in other words, let's not pull the rug out from under them, you know. But how you express that in an ordinance, I can't quite --

MR. STRODTMAN: A little more difficult. I understand. And my last question: How do we handle below-grade situations? There's obviously a few in -- in this area that might be impacted by this, not many, but how would that be applied?

MR. TEDDY: And, Mr. Strodman, are you speaking of the parking or are you speaking of the ground floor requirement on Broadway?

MR. STRODTMAN: Well, I guess, both of them. More the ground floor. I mean, would it be considered the ground floor even though it's below grade, or would that be a basement scenario?

MR. TEDDY: We'd consult the -- if it's the -- the residential requirement, we'd probably consult the building code as to what constitutes a first-floor level, but that's probably something that we'd want to do as a finishing touch to the ordinance if it goes forward is make sure we're being precise about that because, yeah, you -- I'm from Chicago and we had the raised streets there and there's a lot of residential spaces that are a half-story down below the street level because they -- they jacked the streets up to make the sewers work historically, and so that's a very common building type. If you have any of those

sort of garden spaces here, we'd want to deal with that fairly. And a lot of times, those spaces do have commercial on a half-flight of steps above them.

MR. STRODTMAN: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

MR. TEDDY: So that would be kind of an interesting example. On the parking, yeah. I mean, you can have a garage. It can be below grade. It can be below the building. Open to the sky is where the Board of Adjustment gets involved. Under current code, anything that's a surface lot, open to the sky, because the idea was to try to avoid something that's just kind of a big opening in the downtown.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

DR. PURI: Any other questions? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I'm interested in how the ten stories was determined.

MR. TEDDY: Well, you saw in the CID letter, they mentioned ten stories. Again, their original comment to Council as part of the 2013 process, they talked about this ten-story threshold, so that was just something that we picked because we had an example of at least one group that said there could be a differentiated process. Now, the process they're talking about is different. Instead of this discretionary review, there might be some bonus provisions written in for the tall structures, you know. Again, to cite bigger cities, you know, trading off open space for height is an example of the bonus provision. I think that's what they're thinking of, but they're thinking in terms of two tiers. The other thing we considered was high-rise construction, which is around 75 feet, and most of our developers actually take pains to stay under high-rise construction for cost reasons. So that might be a logical thing. But in circulating this, the comments I got from Staff was maybe we want to think in terms of higher than that, you know. I think it was the floor level. I think it was the ratio of floor level to ceiling height and stuff that we adjusted up to get to that 120, so -- now, I've seen an example of a city that actually has a maximum floor level -- for example, 18 feet at the ground-floor level, so you can't do a super-high atrium and call it a story. So there are those kinds of details to consider, too, we don't have in there now.

MS. LOE: And in part because of that -- and I appreciate again the additional language that acknowledges the -- and further clarifies that there are other city plan recommendations for lower heights in some of these areas. And I have to admit I'm a bit concerned that this first point, that a tall building is only evaluated to be consistent with the City adopted plan if it's more than ten stories, but ten stories is automatically higher than the five or eight stories for those two areas. So it appears that this ordinance is preapproving buildings taller than a City adopted plan recommendation.

MR. TEDDY: And the only reason I -- and it doesn't especially make me comfortable, but again that -- that City plan is not itself an ordinance. It hasn't put a height limit. In fact, a lot of these are -- are preliminary to doing further work, you know, and -- because the consultant in that case covered a very broad area and a lot of issues in a -- on a fairly tight budget, you know. So they -- they didn't go into enormous detail to arrive at those, but the point is, there ought to be character areas, and that's becoming common now in downtown zoning districts where you -- I saw one example where there's about seven different character areas each allowing different combinations of height and other standards. The reason we haven't done it for this draft is that really is getting into a level of detail where we want to lean on the

consultant more and have them do that kind of work. I mean, they were here doing field work earlier this month, taking lots of photos. So they're just getting their -- their boots on the ground, so to speak, seeing how our downtown is put together, but they use that data to formulate these kinds of ideas. So, yeah, if you decide it's an issue that you could have the ten-story buildings, have nine-story buildings at the edge of C-2 without any extraordinary review, obviously, we'll have to deal with that and think about amending --

MS. LOE: I guess my concern in the Charrette Report was the product, albeit broader, tighter budget type, that went through some public process, I'm assuming --

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MS. LOE: -- with some buy-in from different groups, and was adopted by the City.

MR. TEDDY: Right.

MS. LOE: So to set that aside at this point seems a bit irresponsible.

MR. TEDDY: We're -- we're not setting it aside, though, is what I'm telling you. Just we're -- we're establishing a standard that right now doesn't exist at all, so it's a kind of a great leap for the City to -- to do this in our C-2 district. If you, the Commission, want to --

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. TEDDY: -- and the Downtown Leadership Council did request that we differentiate the definition of tall structure. But it does -- it's going to be a fair amount of work because we're going to write in all these geographical descriptions and say ten stories, unless located -- and then we're going to give block-by-block coordinates on a few of those examples. But it is in -- I think it's page 37 of Charrette Report where those recommendations first appear, if the Commissioners want to look that up. Tell us if you think that's where we ought to go with this.

DR. PURI: Any other questions, Commissioners? Mr. Wheeler?

MR. WHEELER: One final question. When was this amended -- I guess, amended version first available to the public? Would that have been, like, last Thursday or Friday when we received it?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. We -- yeah. This is -- I'm really introducing it tonight, but it went online --

MR. WHEELER: Exactly.

MR. TEDDY: -- it went online Friday night.

MR. WHEELER: It went online Friday. Okay. Thank you.

MR. TEDDY: And I hate to deal with two versions at once. My impression is, most of the folks here have been studying that one from April. The original idea was we would just take all the comments and criticisms and then pause and decide, okay, how are we going to amend this thing. But we got some pretty intense feedback, and a lot of folks really feel they need to see at least what we're thinking in terms of what we'd recommend in response to their feedback, so that's why I'm offering that amendment, so --

MR. WHEELER: Thank you.

DR. PURI: Any other questions, Commissioners? I see none.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

DR. PURI: Anybody wishing to speak on this matter, please approach the podium. Rules of engagement, any organized proponents will have six minutes, and the opposition organizer will have six

minutes. Every other speaker will have three minutes. This red light up here is to tell you you're almost out of time. Please keep to those guidelines so we can all get out of here at a decent hour. You may approach.

MS. STERLING: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, a special thank you to Mr. Teddy and Staff for all the work they've done. My name is Becky Sterling, and I'm representing the Columbia Board of Realtors here. The Columbia Board -- and, if you need it, I reside at 4605 Apple Tree Lane in Columbia. The Board of Directors of the Columbia Board of Realtors voted to oppose the proposed C-2 zoning changes, and I want to explain why. A primary reason and an initial reaction was because of the process used, that it definitely has been rushed through, that it is possibly on a political agenda, and it's coming to Staff with not enough time to process it through, and the Board didn't think that was a good idea. It appears to be an ad hoc reaction to recent pending proposals. C-2 zoning has been in place a long time, years and years and years, and it didn't really pop up until they started doing something with it. It's motivated by political climate. It's not necessarily motivated by sound planning principles not to change the C-2 zoning. I think most people agree C-2 needs to maybe be looked at and possible changed, but there are established principles and processes in place to do that, and this has -- this has been a matter of circumventing those processes. It doesn't appear to be prudent to make changes before you review something that you have hired someone to do. It -- it doesn't -- it doesn't make sense to me. By what Mr. Teddy said, the level of detail is not there, and so we appear to be rushing in to get interim changes without really have the full scope. It's not a good -- not a good plan. If the consultants said that this is okay and we're going along with what you say, why aren't we taking so many more months to review it? It just doesn't make sense. It's sort of two things. It appears to be more knee-jerk. Unintended consequences have been talked about. There will be unintended consequences, not only to C-2, but possibly to all zoning in Columbia. And I think that's something that no one wants. I think that it needs to be planned out carefully. It would be an overreaching of governmental relations and if you potentially decrease property values within CID, there's going to be a huge hue and cry, and there should be. The discussion draft, and, again, I apologize. I didn't know there was a new draft. I was in Washington, D.C., all last week and just heard about it tonight. But the discussion draft, the City noted successful downtowns are mixed use with housing providing 24-hour downtown and live-in market for downtown markets. If that's true, and I think it is true, why would there be more stringent rules applied to just residential? I think that needs to be looked at. The interim changes proposed, they're more -- the -- the whole deal we've been talking about, the 120 feet or ten stories, is subject to review of Planning and Zoning and approval of City Council. This becomes an entirely political decision. And does Columbia really want to approve or disapprove based on who controls the City Council at any given time? If there are not standards in place that apply, many times in politics, we go from one extreme to the other. So we're setting this up to be changed at the will of whoever is elected to City Council, and it could change often. It could be a double-edged sword. Property rights shouldn't become subjected to politics. If approved by the City Council, legislative body decisions do carry judicial weight, so property owners whose proposed zoning needs meet all the conditions in Section 29-15(d)(7), but are denied a zoning

amendment, have a higher burden to prove why the denial should be invalidated. With this burden on the property owner, the City is reducing property-owners' rights and options. The parking requirements are too narrow in scope. It sounds like this is somewhat being address. This all came about when students started moving in downtown and the proposal -- the apartments were built for the students and there was a lot of question about do -- we really don't want students downtown. We want infill, but we don't want students, you know. It's been an interesting thing. If we want to encourage families, and the City Council, at some point, will have to address what they consider a family to be, this is going discourage it. There needs to be real thought put into the -- into the parking. And what would need to be found out is if this is a violation of the federal Fair Housing Act which applies to municipalities. Parking could be adjusted to help reduce vehicles. So far, there has not been a good planning rationale for proposed excess parking. Excess parking may undercut the City's land use objectives as stated in the C-2 purpose statement. Proposed changes do nothing to provide incentives to developers or property owners to reduce the number of vehicles downtown. Are programs being proposed, such as the rationale of parking spaces, such as shared car services? I heard Mr. Teddy say that tonight, so that was encouraging because there are lots of ways to look at it. The City has not provided clear justifications for greater use restrictions affecting C-2 with dwelling units on the first floor. Specifically, those located on the east side of Eighth to Hitt and from the south side of Walnut down. Our question is: Has the City's legal counsel determined whether this aspect conforms to Missouri zoning uniformity requirements? And I know that your counsel looked at it and said there weren't any problems. We would really request that they find out specifically on that question. Now, people have talked about overlays. Maybe overlays are the way to go. Downtown zoning needs to be reviewed and probably changed.

DR. PURI: Let me interrupt. The six minutes are over now.

MS. STERLING: Oh. Thank you.

DR. PURI: Thank you.

MS. STERLING: I didn't see the light. Thanks.

DR. PURI: The light at five minutes, thirty seconds. We treated you as organized opposition. Okay? Next person please approach the podium.

MR. CULLIMORE: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Dan Cullimore; I live at 715 Lion Street. I am the president for the Board of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association. I had come here with one purpose on behalf of the Board, but given the changes that Staff has proposed, we have not had a chance to review those, so my purpose has changed. I'm going to ask, unfortunately, that you -- that you table this until the public has had a chance to see these changes. However, I do have some comments I would like to make. One of them concerns the idea that this has been a rushed process. The Council asked a number of organizations, commissions, and boards to weigh in on C-2 in January of last year. That's been 17 months. I don't see how anyone can consider this a rushed process. What -- what's happened is that what we have before us is the triumph of what is least controversial that's unfortunately driven out some of what's the best, and some of that best is best viewed by looking at those letters that were sent by those commissions and boards and organizations. There has been talk this

evening about the provision of incentives, and a number of those organizations, including North Central, offered the use of incentives as a part of the interim C-2 process, the interim C-2 code, to encourage both private development and profit and public amenities so that the two would work hand in hand.

Unfortunately, the language that we have before us does not include those things and that's -- that's a real detriment, I think. So I would encourage you to go back and look at those original letters that came from -- I think it was six or seven organizations. I -- it -- were more invited, Mr. Teddy, than -- than the ones who responded?

MR. TEDDY: Well, the -- the original process, going back to last year, was six. I mentioned the Chamber of Commerce, they wrote in a letter, so that would be seven. But when we sent out notice of this ordinance with a copy of it, we used those same six.

MR. CULLIMORE: Thank you.

MR. TEDDY: We gave a general notice.

MR. CULLIMORE: Let me address the issue of necessity.

DR. PURI: You need to wrap up. Twenty seconds.

MR. CULLIMORE: Thank you. The southeast corner of our neighborhood was subject to unrestricted residential C-2 development, and I would point out that we are the only -- we are now the only neighborhood that has a residential parking permit zone. There's a reason for that. We have now neighbors who have been there a long time and have been very good neighbors who are considering moving, and that's because of unregulated C-2 residential development.

DR. PURI: Okay. Sir, you are out of time. Those three minutes are over.

MR. CULLIMORE: Thank you.

DR. PURI: Thank you.

MS. RADER: Hello. My name is Julie Rader, and I live at 3326 South Country Woods. I own several properties downtown, including Bengal's Bar & Grill on the corner of Sixth and Elm, which is one of the spots that we are -- I think got a lot of this started because Park 7 wants to build a very tall residential -- student residential housing there. I'm here tonight to urge you to vote against the interim zoning changes, and I had a little bit of a spiel to tell you, but, actually, the gal from the -- the Board of Realtors, I think, pretty well covered what I think, so I won't take up any more of your time, but I do hope that -- I think this is a pretty reckless thing to -- to do at this point, so I urge you to vote.

DR. PURI: Thank you. Next person, please approach.

MR. LAND: Members of the Commission, my name is Paul Land; I reside at 4104 Jocelyn Court. I'm also a real estate broker in town and I own a couple of properties downtown. It seems to me a lot of -- a lot of brain power to put on -- on a process that 18 months from now we'll have a consultant's report on. It seems to me an incredible waste of your time. I mean, really, I would rather you would devote your time to doing other topics when we have a consultant's report that -- that nearby. If we describe the CID area of consisting of around 150 acres, I want you to visualize what else that might entail. That might be the area of the Vanderveen Subdivision, or it might be the area of Thornbrook, or it might be the area of the Grasslands. And if you were to go to those homeowners and say we only want to change three things in

your zoning classification and just in your neighborhood, how do you think -- but our homeowners association is against it, how do you think that -- do you think this thing would be filled? Yet we have a CID who has come out and said we don't like this ordinance. That's our homeowners association downtown. That's the property owners, that's the business tenants, that's the people who live down there, and they've come out against this, and I support their cause. They have made some recommendations because of the political pressure here to -- to push this thing through. And if you feel compelled to live with that political pressure, then I want you to take the adjustments that they have recommended. I think they've put a lot of effort into researching that and I want you to consider that. Particularly of concern to me is I want to make sure this notice goes out in a proper way in a certified mailing if this ever reaches the Council because there's a lot of property owners in the CID area that don't live in this area. They have investments in this area that are managed by trusts, and we have to ensure that those people are aware of the changes that are coming in this interim change. Thank you.

DR. PURI: Thank you. Next?

MS. GARTNER: I'm Carrie Gartner; I'm representing the Downtown CID, 11 South Tenth Street. I do have recommendations that I forwarded to you. We were asked last time to come back with some thoughts about ways to make this a better ordinance, and we do have a list. So, just briefly, first of all, we did recommend a sunset. We had put down December 31st, 2015, thinking that was when the consultant report would be done, but that's -- that's flexible in our mind. Our goal for having a sunset was to really reaffirm the process of having a city consultant come in, look at the entire code, do the -- do the required public process, and get everyone's input. So we do support that process and we do think a sunset would show support for that process, as well. Second, we do recommend adding language to avoid nonconforming use. Staff has -- has adjusted some of that language and we do urge you to consider that. Third, we -- we support parking requirements of a half space per bedroom provided it does not require onsite parking. We think it makes a little bit more sense to count parking in terms of the number of people, the number of beds, rather than square footage. We also think it makes a lot more sense to talk about really creative parking solutions, offsite parking solutions, as well. I think there's a lot of ways that there can be smart ways to figure out parking rather than just making a surface parking lot behind a building. Fourth, we -- we do recommend that the City establish a parking commission. We have a parking utility, but we don't have a commission of citizens really guiding the process. We're talking a lot about parking and we have concerns and residents have concerns and merchants have concerns, but there's no place where all of those people are at the table really talking through those needs and really guiding how the parking utility builds garages, provides parking, works to really come up with shared parking solutions or alternative transportation solutions. So that is -- that is another recommendation we have. Fifth, we do support the prohibition of residential in certain blocks of the downtown area. We're a little concerned about those blocks spreading. We're also a little bit concerned because the buildings are so long in the historic section -- so deep in the historic section of downtown, certainly an active storefront is -- is good, but there needs to be apartments behind. Finally, very quickly, we want to grandfather. We do think proper notifications should be sent out, and, finally, we do recommend a ten-foot, ten-story limit,

but with bonus zoning. That way, we can provide incentives for people for really good design choices. So I would be happy to answer any further questions about that.

DR. PURI: Did you have time to review this edited document that was presented tonight by Mr. Teddy?

MS. GARTNER: My -- my committee and my board have not had time. It does reflect a lot of what we talked about. I can tell you that our committee met for four hours on this issue, and the more we talked, the more unintended consequences we came up with. So it has been a very long process, but they have not had a meeting or a board meeting since these new recommendations.

DR. PURI: So you have not reviewed the document entirely?

MS. GARTNER: No, we haven't. Not as a -- not as a group.

DR. PURI: Thank you. Commissioners, any other questions of this speaker?

MR. LEE: Yeah.

DR. PURI: Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: Ms. Gartner, are you recommending these changes if the ordinance passes, or are you -- is your organization against the ordinance at this time?

MS. GARTNER: We still believe that waiting for the consulting process is a smart idea. Particularly now that we know that by December of this year, Clarion will have recommendations for us, if I understood that correctly. We're also retaining a consultant to talk through design guidelines. They will have a rough draft for us by July and a final draft in fall. Those are something we see as voluntary at this point, but it certainly can really inform this process. So our thought is we've got two great -- two great processes going right now. We should work through that. If you, as a Commission, decide that that's not feasible, these are our solutions for really kind of avoiding some problems that were red flags to us.

MR. LEE: Thank you.

DR. PURI: Commissioners, any other questions? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Ms. Gartner, if you -- when the commission or when the consultants come back with their review and it's very similar to what's been laid out here and addresses your concerns, would you support what the consultants say as far as amendments to C-2 zoning?

MS. GARTNER: And here's what -- I actually asked my committee and my board that very question. We are not saying hold off as a way to block this. We are not saying hold off as -- as a way to thwart any changes to C-2. And, in fact, we -- I think we had 14 recommendations on how to address C-2 that -- that we gave to planning, so certainly not. I can't guarantee that they're going to agree with every single thing the consultants come up with, but I think there will be a lot more comfort in the process, and I think there'll be time for everyone to really think through all of the issues, and I think that will make everyone more comfortable.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

DR. PURI: Any other questions? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Would you be comfortable with some level of moratorium on construction -- new projects until we have something in place?

MS. GARTNER: No.

MS. LOE: No.

MS. GARTNER: That's -- a moratorium is a very serious step, even more serious than changing C-2 zoning rules. That's something that I think is a step farther than this. And so I think it would be significantly more problematic, not just to my organization, but to others, as well.

DR. PURI: Any other questions, Commissioners? Seeing none.

MS. GARTNER: All right.

DR. PURI: Thank you very much.

MS. GARTNER: Thank you all.

MS. TURNER: Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest. I live in the Fourth Ward. I just wanted to ask you to please consider voting on this matter tonight. It was postponed. I came to your meeting last month. I know I'm on two city commissions, and when the Council asks us to move something along, we try to, and I know that you're trying to. I'm sorry that a very local neighborhood group hasn't had time to meet and that may continue through the summer. I don't know. I know that CID has looked at this matter for a period of time -- well, as we have heard, it's been 17 months. This has actually been looked at for 17 months. I know that with the events that have happened in the last few months, 4,000 citizens collecting a petition about a recent development that was passed with some unorthodox meetings that led -- possibly led to it passing, there's a lot of concern among individuals like myself. I don't have a financial stake, except I have paid property taxes for 30 years, and I'll be asked to pay for infrastructure improvements. So I think that the eye of many citizens is on this issue. They have a concern for growth in the downtown. I -- I was really pleased to see that CID is looking at these issues a little bit differently than -- than I heard from the last meeting. I know the Downtown Leadership Council has support this, except for one member. And when you look at the newspaper articles, the permissiveness of the City's zoning design-- C-2 zoning has made it a draw for developers seeking to build high-density apartment complexes marketed to students. CID -- one of their members spoke out when they voted against it. She was the only vote in opposition and she said I'm really tired that we come down against -- against everything in every vote. I don't know if that's true, but I think that if you don't have a direct financial stake in the presumed increased value in downtown development, you have a lot of concern for unrestricted C-2 zoning, and that's where I am. Thank you.

DR. PURI: Do you have any questions of this speaker? Thank you.

MR. FARNEN: My name is Mark Farnen; 103 East Brandon Road, and I am not organized, so I will only need three minutes. This goes to process. And Mr. Lee brought this up kind of and -- and Ms. Burns did, too, as -- about would you be willing to accept these amendments and would this make you like this better. I think that the discussion so far has been very valuable because it got a whole bunch of stuff out on the table and it did result in the new document, the May 16th language that the staff -- this staff report contains. And I really like the part where they've changed the parking options. I think that -- I think that's working there. But I don't know what happens tonight because I don't know if you guys are going to accept this as it is written in the staff report or if you're going to make further changes to it as

Ms. Gartner asked tonight or if you're going to table it or if you're going to vote against it. And so what I am asking is this: If -- if you're going to table it, I'll come back and say this another day. If you're going to pass it, I want to make sure that the parking parts of the rule that is passed or recommended reflects what is in the city staff report. But if you vote against it or if you don't favor it, then I want to make sure -- then it still goes ahead to Council for their consideration. So what I want to make sure that you vote against reflects what the staff put in the thing you're voting against. So I guess I'm asking if you take action on this, approve the amended language regarding parking, then vote against it and send it on, so what the Council sees is what was really considered at these meetings. I just want to make sure it goes forward with that -- with the good language in there, even if you're against it. Thank you.

DR. PURI: We have some questions for you, sir. Mr. Wheeler?

MR. FARNEN: Yes, sir.

MR. WHEELER: I just have a question. It would appear that your primary concern with this is the parking requirement?

MR. FARNEN: Yes. That's the part that I found most problematic.

MR. WHEELER: Okay. And do you feel that that is adequately addressed or that the solution given would address the other issues?

MR. FARNEN: The -- the issue that I have was in an earlier letter that -- that Mr. Land sent to you, he addressed the situation at Tenth and Walnut, a new project that has been approved unanimously by the Council. It's underway, it has a permit. And so I wanted to make sure that that -- but it has no onsite parking -- has four spaces onsite, but would not meet the test and it would become nonconforming. I was concerned about that. It is permitted, it looks like this language would allow it to go forward, and that's what I wanted to make sure was that in the future, if this burns down and it became a legal nonconforming use, that he would be able to rebuild it in place and not have to then change the entire concept of that place because there's not a place to put parking there. So my first interest was that. But then, as I started looking at it, it looked like really the policies of the City that have been adopted to date really do ask you to invest or use or utilize other parking facilities that are shared or common, public or private, and that that just simply makes sense, so I zeroed in on that part. I am ambivalent about some of the other language or some of the other parts, and some parts of it, I just don't like, but that was the piece that I wanted to make sure was retained. But I didn't know how to do that without asking this body to accept the language that they have provided, even if you vote against it, make sure that's the version that goes forward to the City Council.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you.

MR. FARNEN: Thank you.

DR. PURI: Any other comments?

MR. SIMON: My name is Dan Simon; I'm a lawyer with offices at 203 Executive Building here in Columbia. Mr. Farnen and I represent the same client, and that is the client or the three local businessmen who have a building permit who are now engaged in building a building on the northeast corner of Tenth and Broadway, a project that has received unanimous support so far from the City Council

and a project I want to be sure does not become a nonconforming use, which is a disastrous label to attach to any building. It can't be financed, insuring it is difficult, and there are other problems. So I'm not here and Mr. Farnen isn't here to either support or not support this ordinance. We are just here to represent the interests of a particular client. And so if this ordinance goes forward with the amended language suggested by Mr. Teddy in what he has now shown as Section 29-15(e.6) which says onsite parking shall not apply to buildings that exist or buildings for which building permits have been issued, that's fine with us. And the flexibility that he has added in Section 29-30 as to where the parking can be provided is also fine. So if this goes forward with those two changes, I think you will have dealt with a real unintended consequence and one that we would support. Now, again, I'm not supporting this ordinance, and I'm not not supporting it. I just want to be sure that if this goes forward, it goes forward with those changes. Thank you.

DR. PURI: Thank you. Next speaker?

MS. GREEVER-RICE: Good evening. My name is Tracy Greever-Rice; I live at 602 Red Bud Lane. I also own three different properties that border the central business district, and I want to make just a couple comments tonight. One, is I want to say thank you, Doug, for your many years of service. We really appreciate it. We'll miss you. In terms of the proposal in front of you, I would strongly encourage you to take into consideration Ms. Gartner's, the executive director of the CID, recommended minor revisions to it, and go ahead and pass it tonight and move it along to Council. You've spent a very, very long period of time thinking about how to make these adjustments that are reasonable and provide a set of guidance for how we would like to see our -- our downtown developed in a way that will provide as much flexibility for developers in putting in developments that are reasonable for the scale and size of our downtown. And you're talking -- she's representing the folks who will be most affected and waiting will -- we've waited too long already. Everybody seems to be in agreement with that. We're spending City money, public dollars on consultants to come up with something that we already know from their preliminary reporting is very similar to what you're thinking about here. There's no reason for you to continue to sit on this, and I would respectfully ask you to complete your work that you've spent a lot of good time and effort on and let us move forward as a community. Thank you.

MR. SULLIVAN: Good evening. My name is Sid Sullivan, 2980 Maple Bluff Drive. I wish to thank all of you for your services. It's a -- these are the tough times when the community comes together and -- and chooses to disagree. But let me just give a couple of concepts that -- that I've kind of looked at over time. And one is that we're -- we talk about a taking and a -- and a regulatory taking. Tonight, we're not talking about taking, but we're talking about getting. There's two sides to taking; one is the getting side, and that is the side in which we get advantages to our property. We get police protection, we get fire protection, we get lights. All these things are put in by the City that enhances the value of the property. What we have with the C-2 zoning is a lot of -- of unregulations that we didn't -- that the original drafters of the City ordinance had no intention of -- of believing that we would get to ten- or twenty-story buildings. So the -- the -- by not acting, we are really transferring -- we're using City Council to transfer a lot of public funds -- I, as a taxpayer, I, as a rate payer -- are going to pay for this for my downtown, and I want the

downtown to be one in which I can use and my neighbors can use and my own neighborhood association can use. And I would remind you that as -- as arduous as your task is, this is a temporary assignment. It's not something that's permanent, that's going to be lasting forever for the City of Columbia. When we change regulations within the personnel of our police department, when we change the pension plan, we had a hiring freeze. In effect, it was we are not hiring anybody during this period of time because we don't want somebody hired one day that gets the long pension and somebody hired the next day that gets the short pension, so there is a reason that we have this interim discussion on why we want to restrict some of this so that we're not getting a rush of development during this 18-month period, from the time that we start this process until the time we end. We do have a plan -- a planning consultant and we do have the Downtown Leadership Council that was tasked with coming up with a plan for making the central area useable, and so I think we want to respect that. We have these tasks that will coming forward shortly, the end of this year, the final report the end of next year. So I think the task that you have before you is to come up with a temporary hold on any kind of rush for development that will destroy any future kinds of development and future plans that we could have for the central city for making it a livable and sustainable city. Thank you.

DR. PURI: Commissioners, any questions of this speaker? Seeing none. Any other comments?

MS. SAFFRAN: Good evening. My name is Lisa Saffran; I live at 503 South Garth Avenue. Thank you very much for your time. I am in support of the interim amendments. I think what Mr. Sullivan said was very important, that they are interim amendments. And while there's been some discussion of unintended consequences, I think it's really important to note that not acting also has important consequences. And so I would urge you to act on this. It's temporary, it's interim, and they're important measures, I think, to bring some opportunity for deliberation and transparency into the process, and I -- I think it would be really helpful to do that. Thank you.

DR. PURI: Next? Anybody else wishing to speak, please come up forward. Have a seat in front so we'll be ready to go.

MS. WELCH: I'm Monta Welch, and I'm speaking on behalf of People's Visioning. Ten different organizations are involved with that group. I'm at 2808 Greenbriar Drive. And like other speakers, I want to thank you for your service. It's challenging to come up with the right solutions here. And I want to thank the staff also. I know they've been working hard to incorporate public feedback, which is -- I've heard people talk about that this is political or there hasn't been enough time, but we have had a process of visioning. Partly why People's Visioning exists, because our visioning that was done in the mid-2000s really didn't become implemented very well, and so I think that to respect the fact that the whole community or at least a very broad number of people in the community gave their time, just as you are, to this work on behalf of our community. So I think all of us have to acknowledge and recognize that really there has been an awful lot of input on what does our community want. And the largest number of buildings, it says in any of these guiding documents that have had, as Ms. Lee -- as Ms. Loe has pointed out, that have had this kind of public input talk about six stories, if I'm correct. And so I feel like to move to ten stories, even with some of the considerations for that, might be something that would be inappropriate

to do. I think also that to say that adverse impact would be things like solar panels -- (inaudible) -- or garden rooftops is also inappropriate for this. I think that those would be parts of what people in our community would like and expect to see. We have a lot of information from our community that indicates we like green things, we like green trees and that they have their own benefit, that they bring -- that the folks that live here recognize those benefits and values -- likewise, with solar panels. Those have a very -- or other kinds of means that would be green building codes that certainly I like the -- the people we speak for would like the idea of some of these tradeoffs and perks if you build a, you know, greener building, for instance, with low-flow toilets or, you know, plumbing fixtures, those sorts of things and, you know, high-efficiency appliances, et cetera -- lighting. So I think that those things only make financial sense because we need to recognize that when we can supply -- lower the impact of these infrastructure items on the building we build, that that will be a financial benefit to the public who has to pay whatever part they have to pay or to the developers who have to pay that. So the last thing would be on the parking, and that would be, normally, we love to see less parking and more bus passes and those sorts of things, but I do think that because of the residents who surround this and this push-pull with parking, maybe you're at just a tiny bit too small of parking spaces, and that we would love to see more requests and/or maybe requirements for bus passes. Thank you. Are there any questions?

DR. PURI: Commissioners? Thank you. Next?

MS. BOLLE: My name is Cynthia Bolle; I live at Alexander in the First Ward. I don't represent a bunch of organizations, just myself. I own property there. I want to thank you for your time on this. I especially love the interim amendment. I support your passing the amendment because I have been living in Columbia since '89, and a year ago, I returned from being gone for a little while. And I had gotten the Columbia Envisioned Report and the Charrette Report, and I've been coming to the City meetings, and I keep wondering, well, what's going on with the -- all the work that the public has put into Envisioning how they want the downtown to look? And -- and so I like that this interim amendment addresses some of the -- the decisions or the -- the movement into the -- the way that I -- I have wanted the City to go. I also think that an interim decision is important because I -- I don't want there to be a mad rush on what is a very lax C-2 districting. And so I think that this balances where I think generally the public has wanted to go with -- oh, my gosh. I forget what I was going to say. Anyway, I'm just really nervous. So I think I support it. Do you have any questions?

DR. PURI: Thank you.

MR. STAMPER: Members of the Commission, my name is Don Stamper; I'm a lobbyist. I represent this evening the Columbia Homebuilders Association and the Central Missouri Development Council. I have offices at 2604 North Stadium Boulevard. As you sit and watch testimony -- first of all, I appreciate what you do. Secondly, I think that your disagreement among yourselves and with the Council is healthy. I think a democracy is built on disagreement, and a democracy is refined and perfected through our ability to tear through the disagreement and then come up with common cause. And so I would not be one that would want to change your term limits just because you disagree with me. I think your disagreement is quite healthy actually. If you're for it, it's not moving fast enough, and if you don't like

it, it's going too fast. And that's kind of a dichotomy that we see a lot. I agree with Doug or Dan on one aspect of this. I don't think this is ready for public consumption. I think it's something that ought to be further studied. Secondly, I don't agree with him, just to show you that we have disagreement, that C-2 is unregulated. It's C-2. It's not unregulated. I've been disturbed all along that many of the arguments and initiatives that come with this seem to be designed to force all C-2 properties into a planned district, because, see, we've got to realize that if you pass the -- if the Council passes this, the next day, those projects can still come through, they're just going to come through a planned process, and not through a C-2 process, and I find that to be a manipulation. I find that this advanced hold, temporary citing to be a manipulation of the future outcome of the review of our zoning documents. Those planners have already told us we use way too much planned zoning. We handle it in a different way, and why not just let it come? Why not let it move forward? And so I encourage you, at a minimum, to continue to look at it. Our groups have not had a chance to review. I appreciate the work that's done by the staff. There's some strokes of brilliance in there. There are some things that I really want to separate out and peel the layers off of and see if I like them or don't like them, but I haven't had adequate time to do that, nor have you. And so I think your job as a Planning and Zoning Commission is to be detailed, is to sort through the facts, and to look and bring forward what you think is best for the community, not for a given cause or a given purpose. If -- just imagine what we could do if we took all this time and energy we're putting into doing the petitions and trying to run zoning things through and doing all of these other what I call manipulations, if we put all that into solving the downtown infrastructure problems, what kind of place would we be? So I think sometimes our energies are misguided, and this is a place where I think there's more work to be done. If you have questions or comments, I'd be happy to take them.

DR. PURI: Commissioners? Seeing none, thank you, sir.

MR. STAMPER: All right. Thanks.

MS. WALKENBACH: Hi. My name is Deanna Walkenbach; I live at 407 Pyrenees Drive in the Fourth Ward. I respectfully disagree with my classmate, Donnie Stamper. I think we really do need to go ahead with these interim solutions because I'm afraid we're just going to have -- be inundated with student housing, and we're not going to have any control over what it looks like, how big it is, anything. So I just believe we don't -- we don't -- we can't wait until the consultant's report comes in. So I urge you to go ahead and pass it. Thank you.

MR. MEYER: Hello. My name is Jim Meyer; I'm a real estate broker here in town. I live at 104 Sea Eagle Drive. I have no direct financial interest in downtown real estate. I was concerned and I think some of the discussion brought up by the Commission here points out the subjectivity that's going to be applied to either the granting or disapproval of the building height. I think when you do enter into those kinds of subjective questions about air and light and the provision of emergency medical services, that allows a lot of scope for capriciousness on the part of politically motivated officials, and that does real damage to property rights. I think we have buildings in this country that are taller than ten stories that have adequate provision for fire and EMS, and I think building codes and permitting processes already exist that would still apply. This is an additional layer of regulation that just increases the friction, the

uncertainty, and the time and money required to develop, and I think that's unfortunate. I don't think there are very many issues posed by a 140-foot building that would be radically different than 120. I think there's a certain amount of arbitrariness in -- in this whole discussion. Also, I think that there is -- the logic behind requiring commercial use in areas -- you know, clearly, it will already occur on Broadway and Ninth Street. Those uses have always existed there. But when you try to take that rule and then expand it to other areas of the City, all you're going to do is create problems. If the market will not support a commercial use, it won't exist there, even if that's what is required by ordinance. You're just creating damage to the healthy functioning of the economy downtown. Commercial and office uses are all more valuable than residential uses, so any place where they're commercially viable, they will crowd out residential uses. In places where they're not commercially viable, they won't exist. So I think the whole logic of -- of that restriction is at best superfluous and at worst harmful. Thank you.

DR. PURI: Thank you.

MS. GREEN: I'm Linda Green, 206 Anderson. And I really like what Sid Sullivan had to say, and I am also concerned about a rush to development if nothing is done quickly. I would prefer, I think, a moratorium, but I think the next best thing is to pass this temporary zoning, because I don't want our downtown to be overrun by runaway development in a rush to get things in before this more permanent zoning goes through. So please pass this interim zoning. Thanks.

DR. PURI: Anybody else, please approach and sit in the front so we can finish.

MR. WATTS: Bruce Watts, 1403 Burrwood Court. I didn't want to say anything, but I don't think that we can have businesses where there are no opportunity provided by the residents -- residential development that is built there. And I always kind of recommended that you have first-floor businesses when you have residences downtown or really anywhere, not only to promote walking, but with the same idea of walking communities that we would like to develop elsewhere in town so we don't tear out our green spaces and begin to make it more easy for people to have even home-based services and garden providers, et cetera, within the residential areas so we can have more walkable communities. We're -- many of us, I think almost all of us are very interested here in town in preserving as much as possible. One of the most major draws of Columbia, and we have many here, so we don't really have to keep trying to find ways to draw people here, they're coming in droves. So we want to save the green spaces. We want to save the beauty and enhance it. I personally would like to have more food garden areas available when we develop residences or anywhere, so that we don't get rid of all the green spaces, as along Walnut. But more important than the nature areas are really the people who benefit not only by the beauty and the expanse and sublimity, but all who, you know, benefit by our cultural and educational opportunities here. We would all like to -- to not have deserts of -- you know, people deserts where there are no real people, like along Walnut now. There used to be at least green space there and -- and nice residential homes. Now, we've got lots of people there, but, you know, they're going to have crowd downtown to eat, and it's just -- it seems like a -- it's not possible to have businesses where you don't provide the opportunity, at least street level. I don't want to look like Brooklyn, but I don't necessarily want to look like Manhattan, either. But I like the number of people who are available on the street with the businesses in

a -- in a more bustling area, and I do recommend that we have places for people to visit and to contemplate and to discuss among one another. Thanks a lot, you all. I'm really appreciating your all's consideration, but instead of considering about not hurrying up, I think we need to go ahead and allow for due consideration by passing, doing care in our consideration for -- until we've got better guidelines or more full guidelines from our study. Anyway, thanks, you all.

DR. PURI: Anyone else? I see no one.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

DR. PURI: Discussion, Commissioners? Mr. Wheeler, you're itching?

MR. WHEELER: I am, a little bit. I'm not probably going to be around here for the final on this, so I'm going to put some thoughts out there. I think the first thing that I'd like to address is -- is there's been some discussion about this being rushed, and I think the reason that that's being discussed is that a -- really, a formalized process by the City of Columbia has been circumvented, in my opinion, of -- on how we approach this kind of thing. Normally, a draft is -- a draft comes out. That draft is then passed around and -- and we get input on that, and -- and then we tweak the draft, and then, frankly, P and Z pounds it to death in a work session, and we come out with a draft that we then introduce to the public and we give them a little time to digest it and come back and do a public hearing on it. And I think that's appropriate. It allows for greater diversity and opinions to be expressed and considered. And this time, what we had instead, in my opinion anyway, is we picked some groups. And the appropriate groups were picked -- don't -- don't get me wrong. There are others that should have probably been included, but we -- we picked some groups and had them give some -- express some opinion, and then this thing that we -- pardon me, Tim -- but this -- this -- what's before us -- well, not tonight, but the last time we were here -- came out, and as far as I know, no one saw it prior to our work session agenda or our agenda being published. Now, that, to me, is not the appropriate way to handle something this significant and this important. We've been kicking this thing around for a long time. I agree with that, and someone said 17 months. I'd argue that it was a lot longer than that. This body brought out many of the points that we're trying to address here in a pretty quick fashion, a lot further back than -- than 17 months ago. And so I think the real problem here is that we -- we need a draft that we can put out to the public, let them consider. By Mr. Teddy's own admission tonight, we -- and just to be clear, what I saw tonight when I first -- when he first started giving the presentation, I was like -- we've made significant movement in the right direction. And then I realized that, you know, (a) the public hasn't had a chance to digest this thing really and that -- that instead of making it simpler, we have really made it more complicated, in my opinion, and there's too much ambiguity in this thing. And on an interim basis or not, you can say it's interim, it's going to end, sunset, all of that, but I guarantee you what comes out of the consultant's recommendations will not be less restrictive than what we pass. I guarantee it; mark my words. So I believe in the KISS -- I'm going to shorten this up, because I know everybody here would love for me to, but I'm going to shorten this up. I like the KISS method on just about everything. Just keep it simple and I'll leave out the last part. And -- and, to me, and I've -- I've put this idea out to several groups around town, but I think, as an interim, because I, too, am concerned and agree, by the way, with the reason why we're addressing this issue,

and that is student housing. The -- and I'm going to address some of those issues in my pass -- in my parting remarks tonight, so I won't go into that. But the KISS method would say let's apply a half parking space to every bed created in downtown at a threshold of eight, and it would self-limit everything else we're talking about. A 24-story building would be hard to consider if you're providing parking for all those beds. And so the street scape on commercial would not. I'll -- admittedly -- but I don't think that's really an issue. I think that's something that's been added on to what is actually a parking issue for a residential application which was amended in 2000-- or in 1988, and to my -- or what I've been told -- in 1988, an unintended consequent of which is here we are tonight addressing parking in the C-2 area. We included residential dwellings downtown without specific language and unintended consequences, we see what we get. There you go, folks. It's important to remember the unintended consequences, and I don't believe we are addressing them tonight. I'm in full support of tabling this to allow for that process that should happen to happen. And I won't be here for it, and so I appreciate everybody letting me vent.

DR. PURI: Thank you, Mr. Wheeler. Who is next? Ms. Loe? Go ahead, Ms. Loe.

MS. LOE: I don't always agree with Mr. Wheeler, but I actually do agree with him on this point, which I think the meat of this interim ordinance is the parking. And I would like to posit that since we have the ability to accept and reject what we want, that we reject the height issue, because I feel that is too vague and is getting into subjective areas as have been brought up -- not to say anything about shading public streets. There's too much undefined. And the commercial on street front, I'm willing to let that one go, but I do feel strongly about the parking, and I believe this Commission feels strongly about the parking, and I would like to see that put into place. So I'm willing to cut it down to the bone, so to speak, and just say let's move forward with that piece of it. We've heard support from it tonight that we did not have in the last round.

DR. PURI: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Mr. Wheeler, I concur. I'm feeling like tabling it again for different reasons. I like how the process has developed since it was introduced. The last Commission meeting we had, I challenged stakeholders and interested parties to give feedback to us so that we can make better decisions. I got that. The CID did a very good job. Not only did they say what they opposed, but they gave solutions. That's what I like. If there's anyone else -- interested parties, interested citizens, formally, e-mail, mail, whatever you've got to do to get this in front of us so that you can see this process happening. We've -- you've seen the feedback come in, staff adjusted the language. That's what I want to see happen. We don't have all year. I don't want to keep doing this over and over and over, but we need to get it in now while it's hot so that we can move on and either approve something, disapprove, or send something to Council in the near future. But this process I do like and I think it's working right now. I'm in favor of tabling it at least one more time.

DR. PURI: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Well, Mr. Stanton, I'm sorry. I am not in favor of tabling this again. I think we've had citizens speak about this, I think we've had stakeholder groups give us their input. I think there's flexibility in this plan. I want to thank Mr. Teddy and Staff for going back again and providing us with so

much additional information, and what I consider to be flexibility in this plan that addresses so many of the concerns that we saw four weeks ago. I agree, this is a temporary plan. This has a sunset date. We can agree to that. We can say this will end at a certain time. And when the consultants turn in their report, depending on what they turn in, I don't think there's any guarantee that the people who have spoken tonight or have sent letters are going to agree with that either. But this gives us something, this gives us a placeholder to have so that we have something in place that can address citizen concerns that we've heard tonight. I don't know if you can ever avoid unintended consequences. I think we could revisit this over and over again, and there will always be something that will come up that we never saw coming. So I -- I would vote to support this, support recommendation of this, and I believe that the community has asked for it, and I think it's our obligation to move this forward.

DR. PURI: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe had mentioned about the parking issue. Do you want to -- if you support it -- and height ambiguities, would you be willing to concede on those?

MS. BURNS: I see Ms. Loe's point on that. I just think so many other citizens have other concerns, and that might not be their main thing. The height might be their concern, the first-floor nonresidential issue, so I would hate to push those concerns aside and then maybe pass something that isn't fully what the citizens have asked for.

DR. PURI: Mr. Tillotson?

MR. TILLOTSON: Whew! Mercy! This is tough. I think as a Planning and Zoning Commissioner myself, I totally, at this point, don't have my head totally wrapped around what we're wanting to do. The City Council has asked for something. They don't know -- Mr. Teddy even says they don't know quite what they were asking, but to give them something.

MR. TEDDY: They -- they knew what they were asking for, they just didn't tell us how to write the thing.

MR. TILLOTSON: I would like to send them a document that is really a very good document. I don't think we have that document. I unfortunately believe that whatever document we send to City Council, they're going to take and do what they want with it anyway, and I want the burden to be on them that we did our part. We give the best document from the voices we hear out here each time. It goes back out to the public, comes back, gives us one more time to bite into it -- I mean, to sit and listen to Mr. Teddy do his spiel one more time, and I think we can have something that we can all feel comfortable with in Planning and Zoning that we did what we feel was the right based on public input. So at this point in time, I'm going to have to ask that we table it.

DR. PURI: Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: Well, as members of this body know and Staff knows, I've been an advocate of downtown parking for a long time. I've said many, many times that we're putting in too much student housing or housing with not enough parking. However, that said, that's the only thing I like about this. I believe that certain members of the Council have tried to ram this through because they don't have the control that they want, and they -- they want that control. And I think that we're paying some consultants -- Clarion and Ferrell Madden -- a large amount of money to look at our development codes, and I think we

need to wait and see what they're going to say. There is no guarantee if we put a sunset on this ordinance that Council will accept it. There's no guarantee of that. Council can do as they want to do, as Mr. Tillotson just said. So I believe we should not table this. I believe we should reject it, and that would be my vote. However, if this Commission says we should table it, then I'll go along with that.

DR. PURI: Mr. Strodtman?

MR. STRODTMAN: I'm not going to say a lot of what's already been said, but I will just hit on a couple main points is, you know, I think the number one thing, I think the process was wrong. I think how we approached this and how we got to where we are today was not the way it should have been handled, but we are at this point, so I think we have to do something. As much as I would like to reject it or deny it, I don't think that that's appropriate either. I'm kind of on the fence about tabling it versus sitting some -- sending something forward. I do think that we need to include the items that the Staff has made recommendations on the second draft. I think that we've come a long ways, and I think that's important. So I'm kind of open. I would like to move it forward. We've got a lot on our plates coming down the road, and I think we need to move forward in some regard, though I think there are some changes that need to be made if we are to recommend something to Council. I would like to see a few minor tweaks. And then my last point is -- or last two points, is I would -- I like Mr. Wheeler's point. There's going to be a lot of changes coming down in the next couple of years, and I think everybody needs to be prepared for the discussions that we need to have to make those recommendations to the best that we can. So I think this is just a very introduction to what we're going to be doing in the next couple of years. And so I think -- I hope everybody is prepared for that haul and ready for it and should be getting ready. The last thing I'll make a comment on is I appreciate the 17 people that came up and spoke. It's very important for us to hear your opinion because, unfortunately, a lot of times, we get a minority that comes up to us and so it's nice to get a broader -- even though 17 is not really, in a percentage of our population, a true representation of our citizens, but I do feel like that we had a good representation here tonight, and I -- and I thank you for coming and you might have to come again. So thanks.

DR. PURI: Okay. I'm last. Before I speak, Ms. Gartner, can you come up here to the podium, please? I have a question for you. You -- earlier I asked you, you said that you have not reviewed the document put forward by Mr. Teddy?

MS. GARTNER: Correct.

DR. PURI: And you said your board hasn't met?

MS. GARTNER: Correct.

DR. PURI: When do you plan to meet?

MS. GARTNER: Second Tuesday of the month. I would pull together our zoning committee prior to that, so it would be second Tuesday of June.

DR. PURI: Second Tuesday of June.

MS. GARTNER: Yes.

DR. PURI: Okay. Thank you. I would like to -- it's very difficult situation. I think that you cannot let this go forever because there's a number of citizens that are concerned that are affected by this. But

by the same token, my colleagues and I, we have not had enough time to get everybody's input back on this matter. And we do appreciate Mr. Teddy's hard work in making the amendments that you have made. I think they are in the right direction. There are a lot of ambiguities in your corrections, and the biggest one is the shading on the streets and the building height. I think that needs some work, you know. I think that we cannot have ambiguity in this sort of ordinance. We have done certain criteria. There's certain things that I think you're trying to make happen, but I think that the language needs to be much more clear and concise, and have some parameters, which, at this time, are, you know, devoid of this document. So that is one aspect. The other aspect is parking, parking, parking. We have been saying that from the beginning on a lot of these developments that we have reviewed, and now the parking -- Mr. Wheeler has suggested an idea, and you have also put forth, you know, the -- in the document that we have, you know, seen the comparison between residential and what you're proposing, but I think we still need to work on that, as well. I would request the Commission that maybe you think about tabling this till the CID has met in June -- the second Tuesday of June, and give some further recommendations based on this draft that Mr. Teddy has generated. Then we meet after that and go over this document and then perfect it, like Mr. Tillotson has indicated, and come up with a concise document, the duty that we have been charged with. I don't think we can wait till the consultants come out with their report because there are many steps between the lips and cup. It'll take some time. They say December 15th, 2015, but you don't know. Also, there were certain members that came up to the podium and said that the consultants have already given their preliminary reports and they're similar to what we are looking at in this document. I don't recall any preliminary document. Mr. Teddy, can you shed light on that?

MR. TEDDY: You mean, to date, they've already provided something?

DR. PURI: Yeah. Provided some preliminary --

MR. TEDDY: There was -- there was a letter, but it was just a letter to me saying that I've looked at the draft and this seems like a reasonable approach to handle something that the Council wanted to move forward ahead of our schedule. Now, what's not in the letter that was part of the longer conversation is, let's be careful about disrupting that process. They didn't want to get drawn into this because it's an inefficient way to review and repair an entire zoning ordinance.

DR. PURI: Sure.

MR. TEDDY: But they told Council at the work session following up the letter that they thought it was a reasonably targeted approach because the Council identified three things that they felt were urgent enough to warrant us going forward like we would if we hadn't hired a consultant, which, you know, you all have been part of amendments we have made to pieces of the zoning ordinance over the years. Usually, we have several of those every year, so --

DR. PURI: But are we reiterating the fact that the approach was targeted, but the contents of this document have not been reviewed by them, nor they concur and --

MR. TEDDY: They looked at it and they thought it was reasonable. They said we have nothing to add at this time. Now, if we want to go back to them and say is half a space per bedroom in the ballpark, is that a decent standard? They could give us an opinion on that. Or if we tell them we're really struggling

with the height approval process, perhaps they would offer us a suggestion. But they did not want to disrupt their scope to the point where they back out of everything they're doing with this Module 1, which is, you know, defining the district's structure for the whole city, and just focus on hammering out these problems. For one, we'll be without a budget to get the rest of the thing done. And while C-2 is really important right now to people, you know, we've had issues everywhere in the City that are zoning related, so who knows what, you know, next year's set of issues are going to be. So I think we've got to be proactive and do look at the big picture and reserve enough of their time and talents for that, as well as this. And they have a subconsultant that really is giving a lot of focus to the downtown, so they're -- the proposal that was put out for their services emphasized that is a major part of the work, but it just takes time. And where they're at right now is they're analyzing the GIS data that we provided them, they're looking at their field notes, they're processing all the information and feedback that they've gotten to date, and they're starting to -- they're just starting to draft parts of the code.

DR. PURI: Thank you. With that said, we're not trying to sit on this document. I think some people also made the remark that we're trying to sit on it. I don't think that is the purpose. I think the purpose is to put a quality document forward and then let the City Council decide if that is acceptable or not and do our due diligence. With that, I would request if anybody is interested in making a -- Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Just one last thing, you know. I'm hearing about the parking being a concern of this Commission, but possibly feeling like that could move forward. I know we have the option to recommend approval of the ordinance in whole or in part. If we moved forward with the recommended parking, moved that portion forward with our recommendation for approval, and then considered the other two options at our -- at least we would have completed a portion of our project, and I feel like we would be moving forward.

DR. PURI: Okay. Mr. Wheeler?

MR. WHEELER: I want to comment on that. I -- I actually agree with that in principle, and Ms. Loe, I think, said something similar. My concern is, frankly, that -- well, let me just state it bluntly, since tonight is my last night and they can't fire me. I don't really trust them not to add on to whatever we send them. I mean, that's in their privy, you know. If we send up any kind of an amendment to C-2 and, frankly, I'd like to do that. I think it fixes things personally, or at least in an interim -- in the interim does. But my concern is they will just add on to Mr. Teddy's language, which I feel like has -- although much better and you've done a great job, still has way too much ambiguity in it. And so as much as I'd love to do that, I -- I'd probably have to vote against it.

DR. PURI: Further discussion, Commissioners? Any motions?

MR. TILLOTSON: I'll make a motion to table the C-2 amendment so we can have our staff put together one more round at it and let us have a meeting, even if we have to have an extended meeting, and really hammer it out, give it to the public, and then give Council something that everybody can feel comfortable with.

MR. STANTON: Second.

DR. PURI: Mr. Stanton second. Mr. Wheeler has a comment on the motion.

MR. WHEELER: Yeah. I just -- well, there's two things: (a) that -- that I think, first, we're going to need a date certain, and I think in considering the date certain that we're going to table this to, because we certainly don't want to table it indefinitely, I don't believe. But in considering that date certain, I think that some consideration needs to be -- some consideration needs to be addressed and that would be a work session somewhere in between now and that date certain so that you can discuss whatever additional information and try to -- as I like to call it -- pound it to dust in that work session so that a document can be cranked out of that work session, presented to the public for consideration, and then brought back to a -- to a public hearing. Just food for thought.

DR. PURI: Maybe in July sometime.

MS. BURNS: We tabled it a month last time, didn't we? It was four weeks that we tabled.

MR. TILLOTSON: But we want -- yeah. It was. In the second --

DR. PURI: Want to have the CID meeting in June.

MS. BURNS: Right.

MS. LOE: Right. Our next meeting will be after that meeting.

DR. PURI: What's that?

MR. ZENNER: Your next meeting will not be after the CID second Tuesday in June.

MS. LOE: Like, end of June?

MR. ZENNER: The next Planning and Zoning Commission meeting will be June 5th. The CID's scheduled meeting would be June 10th, and then your following Planning Commission meeting would be June 19th. Staff reports for public review and for the Commission's review would be due June 13th. Mr. Wheeler's -- Mr. Wheeler's point is well taken on Staff's end of being able to generate a document that is actually able to be viewed by the public. There is a challenge here. You have a moving target, and you have a public that has indicated that they do not have time to adequately review that document. There's two things that need to be settled here: One, how much time do you want for the public to review the document before you take it up again; and two, how long do you want to let the public comment so you have enough information to react to their comments themselves. And at this point, we could go on indefinitely based on the fact that people keep telling us they haven't had time to review the document. It's posted, it's being -- it's been well covered. I mean, I think we need to either set a date that you want to have a document draft available, not held by the Planning Commission at a hearing, and allow the public to review that document and then set the date for the public hearing to commence following an adequate period of time for it to review -- to be reviewed. I mean, I'm hearing this evening that they want every C-2 property owner notified. That is going to be an expensive, as well as a very time-consuming process. And if we have many property owners that are not local, you're going to have to give them, obviously, an adequate period of time to either review it on our Website or be able to send us comments, and we don't know where all those property owners are from. I mean, that just becomes a real practical problem for us and for the commission. So I mean, it's how inclusive do we want to be one, and how much time do you believe you need in order to, as Mr. Wheeler has pointed out, pound this issue out with all of the information that you believe you need? We'll do whatever you would like to do, but we also need to have

time to produce staff reports according to what our schedules are and advertise appropriately.

DR. PURI: Mr. Zenner, that's what we're trying to do. We're trying to find adequate time, balance, and so that's the purpose of asking you after the CID meeting, the time you would need to review those comments. Mr. Teddy's document was already posted last week on the website.

MR. ZENNER: However, that document is going to be changed based on the comments that you have heard this evening and based on the additional comments that you may have from other entities. And so I guess the question that I'm asking is, is how much time do you want to allow up to the point of the CID Zoning Committee meeting, which would be June 10th? Is that where you want to cut off the comments from the general public waiting for CID to finish their meeting and then request that their comments be provided to us no later than the 13th of June? If that's the case, you do not have -- we do not have adequate time to produce a staff report for the 19th. It would be pushed -- it would be pushed --

DR. PURI: That's understood. That's why we're suggesting July.

MR. ZENNER: It would be pushed to the first meeting in July, which would be July 10th. And that will only allow you, if we have to have a week potentially to make changes, we're not going to have a document out for public evaluation until potentially either June 20th or June 23rd, which only leaves you two weeks in which to have that document adequately reviewed by the public. Is that enough time for you?

DR. PURI: We were talking about the second meeting in July.

MR. ZENNER: The second meeting in July would be July 24th, and that would then require that any comments be submitted no later than July 14th.

MR. TILLOTSON: I'm up with that.

DR. PURI: Commissioners, July 24th? So Mr. Tillotson, you're going to amend your motion with the date of July 24th?

MR. TILLOTSON: Of July 24th for Case 14-48.

DR. PURI: Mr. Zenner, is that adequate time frame?

MR. ZENNER: That would be adequate time frame for us to produce the report. My question is: Do you want us to -- do you want to set a date certain for remaining public comment to be received?

DR. PURI: June 13th. You already said it.

MR. ZENNER: Okay. That would be the last date for public comment at that point?

DR. PURI: That's correct.

MR. ZENNER: Or -- that is June 13th.

DR. PURI: June 13th. You need time to prepare the report.

MR. ZENNER: June 13th would be the last day for public comment. And that means then, if we do June 13th as your last day for public comments, all public comments received by that date would be brought forward to a June 19 work session, which then would be allowed -- we could discuss what those public comments may be. I mean, until I -- until we have CID's comments and all the public comments, you have a June 19th work session with it. We would produce then for the July 24 meeting, which gives us until roughly -- it gives us one additional work session in July should you want to review the document,

and we could post it or we could post it sooner than that. I mean, I'm -- again, I am concerned as to the issues we have heard this evening that there has not been adequate time for the public to review it. Typically, we have advertised or we have allowed a document of this nature to be out for public evaluation for one month, no less than two weeks. And at the rate that we're going at, we keep pushing this back. By the time we're done, because of adequate time and notices and a variety of other things, we may be somewhere into August if we want to hold to what our standard is. I'm just very concerned that you're going to have the same turnout that you've had here this evening that claims that they haven't looked at it.

DR. PURI: I think, Mr. Zenner, the distinct issue here is the fact that Mr. Teddy has changed the language and going in the right direction, so we have consensus on that. There are some ambiguities in his document that need to be cleared up. He's going to go back to the drawing board and fix those ambiguities. In the meantime, CID will have their meeting and give their comments. The public can digest this main body of work that Mr. Teddy has printed and then it's on the website. Those comments will be back by June 13th. You will compile those comments, we'll come to our work session June 19th. We will look at that and tweak Mr. Teddy's body of work that is already in play, and that document will be ready. Then it won't be voted on until July 24th. And the next time, there is not going to be a third time. This is what the Commission's voice is, so I don't see a problem here. Mr. Tillotson; is that acceptable?

MR. TILLOTSON: That's exactly right.

DR. PURI: We want a second to that.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton.

DR. PURI: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Second.

DR. PURI: May I have a roll call, please.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is for Item 14-48A. The motion is to table this item until the July 24th Planning and Zoning meeting.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval. Voting Yes: Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Lee, Dr. Puri, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Mr. Tillotson. Voting No: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 6-2.

MR. STRODTMAN: The motion to table has -- will move forward as passed.

MR. ZENNER: Dr. Puri, if I may?

DR. PURI: Yes, sir.

MR. ZENNER: What that -- what you have just done will then allow Staff to post the revised document, the edits to the current document that is available on June 27th, which will then allow us one month, roughly, from the posting date to the public hearing date, which would be July 24, again.

DR. PURI: I agree. And that's what the intention was and it's in TV land now, so --

MR. ZENNER: Thank you. I just wanted to make sure everybody knew.

DR. PURI: Yeah. Comments of the public? Mr. Stanton, comments --

MR. STANTON: I just want to before we get to public comments, I wanted to ask CID, you see

our -- do you see our situation. Is there a way you can get your input to us faster so we can process that? It seems like your input is very important. Can you give us some heat? You know, can you --

MS. GARTNER: I would say -- (inaudible).

DR. PURI: You have to approach the podium to reply so she can transcribe. Thank you, Ms. Gartner.

MS. GARTNER: I would say that given with the holiday, I would take the first week in June to have the Zoning Committee meet. We've been meeting twice, so that's two meetings. And then I would have that following Tuesday, the second week, the Board meeting. So I would fit three meetings into those first two weeks of June -- first ten days of June.

MR. STANTON: Can we use the power of technology? That's what I'm getting at. I mean, your input is important, but I'm not really willing to just keep waiting just because -- for your convenience, because I'm going to take the information that we've got and we'll move forward.

MS. GARTNER: I completely understand. We are -- our hands are tied because we have public meetings, so we can't do it via e-mail, we can't do a discussion that isn't open to the public and the membership to participate. Well, you know how it works. So I can -- I can push three meetings as quickly as possible, but it's three meetings.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

DR. PURI: Mr. Stanton, Memorial Day next week, so I think she's in good shape. All right. Thank you. Comments of the public?

VI) COMMENTS OF PUBLIC

MR. CULLIMORE: Dan Cullimore, 715 Lion Street. Mr. Wheeler, I want to thank you for your service on the Commission. I haven't always seen eye-to-eye with you, but I certainly appreciate your zest for what you have done here. I would also like to remind the Commission and the Chairman that other organizations have spoken tonight who might also wish to review this amended document, and our meetings were not considered. The time line does allow North Central Neighborhood Association to meet and we'll have adequate time for comment, but I would ask that you consider the other organizations that have spoken when you set your time lines. Thank you.

DR. PURI: Thank you. Anybody else, comments of the public? Seeing no one.

VII) COMMENTS OF STAFF

MR. ZENNER: Whew! What a meeting. Your next meeting is June 5th, and it will be a little bit easier than tonight's, though we do have a number of items on the agenda and we will be introducing a new Commissioner after this evening. It is with sadness, my five and a half, almost six years of being here with Mr. Wheeler, it is has been always an interesting and educational process, a man who is not often short on comments, nor on his focus and his zest for what he has provided us a service. Doug has worked through many things with us as a Commissioner to area plans, a comprehensive plan, and many zoning text changes for some relatively controversial issues, and it has always been a pleasure to work with him. His tenure as a chairman and filling in for Jeff Barrow during his absences during Jeff's tenure was also very enjoyable. You will be missed, Doug, even though you don't think so. Ten years of service

brings institutional knowledge, as well as a background that will be difficult to replace. We wish you the best as a staff. The door is always open if you need assistance, not that we will give you any special preferential treatment, but we will give you answers and a cup of coffee every once in a while.

MR. TEDDY: May I second and move to approve what Mr. Zenner said. We appreciate all you've done with us over the years, Mr. Wheeler. On behalf of all the staff, we appreciate all you put into the Commission, your dedication and your candor at the meetings, that you're always focused on the issues at hand, and we greatly appreciate that. You've been very nice to work with. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: We do have some items, though, that we will have to cover in Mr. Wheeler's absence. On the June 5th agenda, we have what often doesn't come to us, but we have a combo action, a subdivision and a public hearing. This will be for The Gates Plat 2. This has an annexation component associated to it, which is why you have a permanent zoning, and it has two zoning classifications associated with it, a PUD as well as an R-1 component, and you will be approving a preliminary plat. They will be separate votes, but we will handle them under a combined public hearing and subdivision title on our agenda. And then you have three -- or four public hearings, three planned unit developments, one for just a standard PUD development out off of Richland Road, and two C-P development plans. One is for the Red Oak site directly across from the Grindstone Walmart, and then we have a Columbia Supply up off of Rangeline. This is just north of the Moser's in this general location off of Highway 763. And then the long awaited discussion associated with the accessory dwelling units will be the ordinance amendment on this agenda, an item that was originally introduced and requested by former Councilmember Schmidt, and after many work sessions and beating out the dust of this ordinance, as Mr. Wheeler puts it, we are ready to bring it forth for public comment. And it will again be available under our standard application procedures for the public to review the Friday prior to our Planning Commission meeting. Your maps associated with two of our projects. The Gates, now, this is down off of Old Plank Road, south of Route K, immediately to the west of this particular project. We approved The Gates Plat 1, the rearrangement and final plat, last Planning Commission meeting. Immediately to the right of that then is the Lake George plat. This is a parcel that is off of Richland Road just east -- or west of the Richland Road rezoning request and annexation that is off of Rolling Hills. Bay Meadows was immediately to the north on that slide. And then our other two C-P plan projects, The Lot 6 at Red Oak, this is the parcel that we recently did the tree swap on, and then the parcel on the right-hand side is the GME Columbia Supply off of Rangeline. This will result in the extension of Bodie Drive, which is an intended neighborhood collector that will provide access over to Edington Boulevard and a number of the other residential developments further to the east. And then immediately to the south of this particular site is where the Moser's is. We have nothing else for this evening. Again, thank you very much for your time, and we will have our meeting agendas ready for you.

VIII) COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

DR. PURI: Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE: Before Mr. Wheeler has his final say, I'd just like to say -- thank him for his service and also his counsel to me and mentoring to me a little bit, you know, with a number of one-on-one

conversations about things that I should look for, know about, think about as it comes to serving on this body, and I appreciate it very much, Doug.

MR. TILLOTSON: I would like to ditto that. I've got to work with Doug now for four years. I come on here thinking I knew everything and knew pretty nothing, so it is quite an honor to work with somebody that knows so much and you can rely on their expertise, whether you agree with him all the time or not, and I have appreciated it and have enjoyed many years of your friendship. Thank you.

DR. PURI: Rusty?

MR. STRODTMAN: I will make it short. You know, this is an example of not having term limits. Doug's knowledge is going to be very, very much missed. And the good news is we have his cell phone number, so we can just reach out to him during these meetings, text him, and he'll give us some advice. So thanks for everything you do, Doug.

MR. LEE: You don't mind if we call you at 8:30, 9:00 on a Thursday night?

MR. WHEELER: No. No. Not at all. Not at all.

DR. PURI: Mr. Wheeler, I'd like to salute you. I have served seven years, almost, with you and it's been wonderful, and they're big shoes to fill -- all your knowledge. And I agree with the term limits. I think that this Commission, like I've said, at times, it just takes a few years to get rolling as far as a Commissioner. But your knowledge, your depth, and your forward thinking and focus is -- is irreplaceable. I thank you.

MR. WHEELER: Thank you. Well, let me first say that I haven't agreed with a lot of people, but I have heard what you said and tried to incorporate that into what -- at least what I thought the best of the ideas were into what I tried to get done while my time was here. And since I have this inherent knack to ramble, I thought I should, like, prepare something, and so I'll -- I'll actually read this and it will probably sound like I'm reading it, but -- but I want to start by thanking John John. He was instrumental in my original appointment to this body. He and I disagreed on a number of issues and projects over the years, sometimes heatedly, but I respect him and consider him a friend. It's been pointed out -- there's a picture that accompanied the article about me in last night's paper has no resemblance. I would point out that that was prior to ten years on this Commission, which included, I believe, two terms as chair, one as vice-chair, and three as secretary. Andrew Denny did request a newer photo, and was nice enough not to mention my lack of hair as the reason why. There have been numerous changes in Columbia over the last ten years. Nearly all the City planning staff have come on board since I first -- since the beginning of my first term, and we've assembled a great group. I have enjoyed working with all of them. I would like to give a special thanks to Pat Zenner who, though he gets a little windy, as I do, at times, was a great help to me when I was chair and working on the comp plan. I would like to clarify a comment in last night's paper that the planning staff is more progressive than the staff I worked with in the beginning. I stand by the statement. I don't see necessarily this as a bad thing, as long as everyone is aware of it and there is a healthy dose of reality added, which I find true anytime one is dealing with progressives, so now you have that. Since the article stated that I am often outspoken, I thought I'd go out on a -- on a nice one there, so there's some points I want to make and I think they're very important. And so the -- I want to point out that

I have been careful for ten years not to be as harsh as I would like to have been at times. As -- as an example, I want to point out some recent decisions that I think -- or fairly recent decisions that I think everyone would agree span City Council is at either end of the ideological spectrum and have significance of what we were facing today. The first was the less than intelligent -- if I were being less benevolent this evening, I would say stupid -- decision to expand the C-2 district for student housing. The next is the less than intelligent idea that most college students who can afford a \$700 bedroom don't have a car and therefore there is no reason to make provision for those vehicles. Notice I am not debating the need for a car. My point is that most have a car. Last, I would like -- I would hope everyone is -- and I hope that everyone is getting the connection -- is the interim changes to C-2 zoning. It is less than intelligent to propose changes to C-2 zoning without first engaging the various stakeholders and utilizing the proper process, which we have hammered out this evening. I just want to reiterate that. Certainly, this action was less than intelligent when no notice is given to the property owners from the beginning. These three examples, I believe, show the evolution of one of the problems our City is facing. Trends must be recognized and addressed proactively. If the issue of student housing parking had been given the time and thought it should have been when this body first brought it up, the current rush to change C-2 zoning would have been avoided. And, more importantly, could have been handled in a manner more appropriate and respectful of the underlying real property rights. There are a lot of very intelligent people in our City who are willing to come together and solve the issues we face. Experience has shown me that we come up with better solutions when we engage more people and we respect the rights of others. One of the keys to recognizing trends in our community is by allowing Planning and Zoning Commissioners the time to learn the planning process and the related materials and serve on the commission long enough to see what is happened; i.e., the trends. As I thought about the less than intelligent idea of shortening the term limits of Commissioners, this thought has come to the front of the many reasons why this is such a bad idea. We deserve better. Columbia deserves much better. So before I wear out my welcome, which I always have -- already have tonight, I come to my pearls of wisdom for present and future commissioners: One, you're here to guide or help guide the City in the planning process. You have a personal bias -- we all do. The sooner you can put that aside and look for the best ideas from all sides of an issue or proposal, not just the ones that most closely align to your personal opinion, the better. By doing so, you will serve the 70 to 80 percent of our citizens in the middle. It is -- it is hard to do better than that. From time to time, it will not be possible, but look for the opportunities. I hope that I have lived this idea and there -- if there is any lasting memory of my time on the Commission, this trait is what's remembered. Second, it's okay to disagree with Staff. We are blessed with a very professional staff and they are good at what they do, but the reason citizens serving on boards and commissions is so critical is that you need perspective they bring to the process. Because of this unique perspective, things or aspects are considered that may not be considered by Staff. Don't be afraid to go against the grain when needed. Three, the most important pearl that I can pass on is the importance of always looking for the unintended consequences of the action being debated. This may seem like a small matter, but it is critical. What seems like a great idea in theory can have significant -- a significant negative effect or many

negative effects. Call out the unintended consequences when you see them. I could give examples, but I'm rambling, so I won't. So Pat Daugherty once said, as he was leaving the Commission, that ten years was long enough and it was time to move on and let someone else do it for a while. I leave knowing that the Commission is in fine hands. This is a great Commission. When I began my first term, the makeup was way out of balance. I believe that this is a very well-balanced group, and I think that is absolutely essential. It is absolutely essential that it remain that way. By being so, it allows for the best proposals and projects possible. Thank you for your service. Finally, I want to say thank -- say how grateful I am that I've been allowed to serve the City of Columbia in this way. It has been an honor. Thank you.

DR. PURI: Thank you, Mr. Wheeler.

IX) ADJOURN

(The meeting was adjourned at 9:46 p.m.)