

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
June 19, 2014
Conference Room 1-B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Commission Members Present: Burns, Lee, Loe, Reichlin, Stanton, Strodman, Tillotson

Commission Members Absent: Russell

Staff: MacIntyre, Teddy, Zenner

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA: None

TOPICS DISCUSSED – New Business:

- **C-2 District Revisions – Final Draft Discussion**

Mr. Teddy distributed handouts to the Commissioners and began his presentation by explaining their content. He continued by providing a general overview of how the meeting this evening could proceed. Following his introductory remarks, Mr. Teddy explained in greater depth what was included in the hand-outs.

Mr. Teddy stressed that that no ordinance changes had been made at this point to the draft introduced at the May 22 meeting. He noted that comments that had been received regarding the draft and how it addressed several issues in the very first draft (April 24) have been somewhat supported. Mr. Teddy went through a detailed explanation of the contents and comments within the letters received. Based on concerns expressed in one of the letters regarding property owner notification, Mr. Teddy addressed what staff was prepared to do regarding that issue.

Mr. Teddy explained that the staff memo/handout was structured to address the comments received regarding the proposed draft ordinance. He explained that the memo covers the three primary issue areas of 1) non-residential on the ground floor, 2) building height, and 3) minimum parking standards.

Mr. Teddy explained the issues relating to the non-residential on ground floor provisions. There was Commission discussion regarding the proposed text and how the issue would be handled. Concern was expressed that the provisions needed to encourage better building design that created activated street frontages and not result in focusing on restricting residential development in the downtown.

After much discussion it was determined that the proposed standards required no changes. It was suggested; however, that the term “non-residential” be changed to “active” in consideration of concerns that some types of non-residential use may locate on the street frontage and offer no active features to engage the public. There was additional discussion regarding changing the “non-residential” language to “active”; however, the Commission elected to leave the term unchanged.

Having addressed the issue of non-residential uses, Mr. Teddy introduced the issue of tall structures within the downtown. He explained the specific concerns with the way the standards were currently

written and went through a series of proposed options to make the standards more specific and predictable.

There was Commission discussion regarding the proposed options. Commissioner Tillotson expressed concern about the "impairment of views" provisions. He felt that the standard should not be used since it did not clearly express what the "special" buildings/views would be. There was additional Commission discussion on this topic. Several Commissioners commented that some of the existing plans relating to downtown addressed the issue of view corridors and building height.

Commissioner Loe expressed concern regarding the inconsistency of how the height regulations and approvals would be given. She suggested that future building height be regulated according to adopted/approved plans. There was discussion on this topic as well; however, no consensus was reached directing staff to include such provisions into the final draft.

Consensus was reached; however, on what to do with the provisions relating to view corridor protection. The Commission requested that the standards be removed from the proposed amendment and that the section dealing with building height be moved forward with the rest of the ordinance changes.

Having addressed the issue of building height, Mr. Teddy explained the concerns with the parking standards and the changes proposed. There was Commission discussion regarding the changes and agreement that standards were required. Some Commission desired a one-to-one ratio of parking to beds.

Mr. Teddy explained that such a scenario would result in parking greater than that required in the R-3 district. Mr. Zenner noted that a possible outcome of such a parking requirement would be to make housing in the downtown cost prohibitive and force it elsewhere – likely to the suburban fringe. Such an outcome would be counter-productive in fulfilling the objectives of Columbia Imagined.

After additional discussion, the Commission agreed that the proposed parking standard of 0.5 space/bedroom would remain unchanged.

- **May Building Permit Report**

Mr. Zenner gave an overview of the permit report. There were no Commissioner questions relating to the report.

OLD BUSINESS

No old business items discussed.

ACTION(S) TAKEN: June 5, 2014 minutes were approved. No other votes or motions were made.

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:50 p.m.