

BOONE COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
BOONE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER, COMMISSION CHAMBERS
801 E. WALNUT, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
(573) 886-4330

Minutes

7:00 P.M.

Thursday, April 21, 2011

I. Chairperson Harris called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., with a quorum present.

II. Roll Call:

a. Members Present:

Boyd Harris, Chairperson	Centralia Township
Carl Freiling, Vice-Chairperson	Cedar Township
Mike Morrison, Secretary	Columbia Township
Gregory Martin	Katy Township
Eric Kurzejeski	Missouri Township
Michael Poehlman	Rock Bridge Township
Kevin Murphy	Perche Township
Paul Prevo (arrived 7:05)	Rocky Fork Township

b. Members Absent:

Larry Oetting	Three Creeks Township
Derin Campbell	County Engineer
Brian Dollar	Bourbon Township

c. Staff Present:

Stan Shawver, Director	Uriah Mach, Planner
Thad Yonke, Senior Planner	Bill Florea, Senior Planner
Paula Evans, Staff	

III. Approval of Minutes:

Minutes from the March 17, 2011 meeting were approved by acclamation.

IV. Chairperson Statement

Chairperson Harris read the following procedural statement:

The Boone County Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory commission to the County Commission. The commission is made up of individuals representing each township of the county and the county engineer.

The Planning and Zoning Commission makes recommendations to the County Commission on matters dealing with land use. Tonight's agenda includes a rezoning request for a planned development and one subdivision plat.

In general, the Planning and Zoning Commission tries to follow Robert's Rules of Order, however, it is authorized by the Missouri state statutes to follow its own by-laws. The by-laws provide that all members

of the commission, including the chairperson, enjoy full privileges of the floor. The chairperson may debate, vote upon or even make any motion.

The following procedure will be followed:

The agenda item will be announced, followed by a report from the planning department staff. At that time, the applicant or the applicant's representative may make a presentation to the commission. The commission may request additional information at that time, or later following the public hearing. After the applicant's presentation, the floor will be opened for a public hearing to allow anyone wishing to speak in support of the request. We ask that any presentation made to the commission be to the point.

Next, the floor will be given over to those who may be opposed to the request. Direct all comments or questions to the commission and please restrict your comments to the matter under discussion. Please be considerate of everyone here. We ask that you please not be repetitious with your remarks. We also recognize that some issues can be quite emotional. In that regard we ask that you refrain from applause, cheers, or other signs of support or displeasure. Please afford those with a different point of view than yours the same respect and consideration you would like yourself.

There may be individuals that neither support nor oppose a particular request. Those individuals are welcome to address the commission at any time during the public hearing portion of the request.

Please give your name and mailing address when you address the commission. We also request that you sign the sheet on the table after you testify. Also, we ask that you please turn off your cell phones.

Any materials that are presented to the commission, such as photographs, written statements or other materials will become a part of the record for these proceedings. In that regard, if you would like to recover original material, please see the staff during regular business hours after they have had an opportunity to make a copy of your submission.

After those opposed to the request have had a chance to speak, the applicant will have an opportunity to respond to the concerns of those opposed to the request. Next the staff will be given an opportunity for any additional comments, as appropriate. The public hearing will then be closed and no further comments will be permitted from the audience or the applicant unless requested by the commission. The commission will then discuss the matter and may ask questions of anyone present during the discussion. Finally, a motion will be made to either recommend the approval or denial of the request to the County Commission. Please note that the Boone County zoning regulations and subdivision regulations are considered to be a part of the record of these proceedings.

All recommendations for approval are forwarded to the County Commission. They will conduct another public hearing on Tuesday, May 3rd. Interested parties will again have the opportunity to comment on the requests at that time. The County Commission generally follows the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission; however, they are not obligated to uphold any recommendation. Requests that are denied will not proceed to the County Commission unless the applicant files an appeal form within 3 working days. Please contact the planning office to see if a request that has been denied has filed an appeal, as there will be no further public notification due to the short time between the hearing tonight and the County Commission hearing. The County Commission hearing scheduled for Tuesday, May 3rd, will begin at 7:00 p.m. and will convene in this same room.

V. Conditional Use Permits

None

VI. Rezoning Requests

1. Request by Joseph and Paula Vomund on behalf of Corey Nettles to rezone from R-S (Single Family Residential) to C-GP (Planned General Commercial) and to approve a Review Plan on 1.82 acres, more or less, being lots 125 and 126 of the Replat of Sunrise Estates Subdivision, located adjacent to 7400 E I-70 Drive SE, Columbia.

The subject property is located to the east of the City of Columbia, near the intersection of Sunny Vale Drive and I-70 Drive Southeast. The property is identified as lots 125 & 126 of Sunrise Estates Subdivision. The subject property is 1.82 acres in size and is currently zoned R-S (Residential Single-Family). It has R-S zoning to the south and east, C-G (General Commercial) zoning to the west, and A-2 (Agriculture) zoning across I-70 to the north. The R-S & A-2 zonings are original 1973 zoning. The C-G was rezoned from R-S in October of 1988. The applicant is requesting a rezoning from R-S to C-GP (Planned General Commercial) with the use of the property limited to a parking lot and/or a display lot.

This proposal is designed to support the C-G zoned property to the west of the subject tract. The applicant is interested in converting the existing structure to the west of the subject tract for use as an auto body shop for custom vehicles. As a part of that use, additional parking, display space, and space for internal traffic circulation is needed. Since the property is sandwiched between I-70 and a developed residential subdivision, a gravel lot would be inappropriate, and a dust-free hard surface will be needed to help minimize the impact of the proposed uses. The display lot and parking lot uses are available under the C-G zoning district.

Under the Boone County Zoning Ordinance, there are two methods to rezone property, open rezoning and planned rezoning. An open rezoning provides access to a broad list of uses, all of which must be able to be supported, making it more difficult to get approved. A planned rezoning request allows an applicant to propose a specific set of uses, along with a site plan showing how those uses can be supported and function at the proposed location. Any changes from the proposed uses or site plan are required to go back through a full review and public hearings to get approved. In this case, a planned rezoning request will limit the impacts on the large residential neighborhood to the south, and protect the rights of the residents of that neighborhood by giving them notice and the opportunity to oppose or support any future changes

In the Boone County Master Plan and the East Area Plan, this area is identified as residential. The Boone County Master Plan identifies a "sufficiency of resources test" to be used in determining whether there are sufficient resources available to support the proposed uses. The East Area Plan describes a similar process as desirable for the expansion of existing commercial areas.

The sufficiency of resources test can be broken up into three categories: utilities, transportation, and public safety.

Utilities: This site is served by Public Water Service District #9 for water service, Boone Electric Cooperative for electrical service, and the Boone County Regional Sewer District for wastewater services. There is existing domestic water service along Sunny Vale Drive, but it is insufficient for commercial fire flow requirements. An 8" main would need to be extended for commercial fire flows, either from

Broadview Court (approximately 3400 feet to the south) or by boring underneath I-70 to the northern side of the highway. Wastewater services for the proposed parking or display lot uses are minimal, and the existing Boone County Regional Sewer District facility to the west can meet those needs. There is an existing private sewer line in the southeastern portion of this property that serves two lots to the east. There also appear to be old lateral fields on this property. Compliance with the Boone County Stormwater Ordinance is proposed to be handled by a detention and filtration system located in the southern portion of the subject property.

Transportation: This site has direct access on to I-70 Drive Southeast. The plan proposes two new entrances, one from each of the lots being rezoned. I-70 Drive Southeast is Missouri Department of Transportation right of way. MoDOT has requested that the eastern access on the property to the west of the subject tracts (lot 127) be either removed or merged with the driveway proposed on lot 126. The applicant has agreed to that change. Further transportation issues will lie in the hands of MoDOT.

Public Safety: This site is in the Boone County Fire Protection District for fire protection and the Boone County Sheriff's Department for police services. The Boone County Fire Protection District has indicated that fire protection at 1000 gallons per minute pressures for a fire hydrant will need to be present for their approval. At this time, water is not available on-site to meet that need.

Zoning Analysis: This request suffers from a limited ability to meet the sufficiency of resources test in two areas, utilities and public safety. The plan does provide for a buffer between the commercial area and the residential neighborhood in the form of the fencing with the proposed stormwater design. The identified weakness is limited access to public water sufficient to meet fire flow requirements as identified by the Boone County Fire Protection District. The lack of fire protection limits the ability of public safety services to protect the health, property, and well-being of the property owner and residents in the adjacent residential neighborhood. This lack of infrastructure is detrimental to more intense development of this property. Therefore, the property should not be rezoned until the infrastructure issues are resolved.

The property scored 62 points on the rating system.

Staff recommends approval of the request with the following conditions for approval:

1. That fire protection issues are resolved to the satisfaction of the Boone County Fire Protection District prior to approval of the final plan.
2. That easements be created to cover the private sewer line that serves lots 106 & 107 to the east of the subject tract.
3. The parking area cannot be gravel and must be a dust-free hard surface to minimize off-site impacts to the surrounding residential neighborhood.
4. That no junked, damaged, or inoperable vehicles will be stored on this parking/display lot.

Present, representing the request:

Chad Sayre, Allstate Consultants, 7401 Fall Creek, Columbia

Chad Sayre: In our meeting with the water district we did a cursory study to look at options for complying with upgrading the entire water system in order to provide fire flow. In lieu of that we have proposed to restrict the site to parking uses which will limit the amount of fire risk. We agree with staff's comment; I don't believe the fire district has weighed in on the entire plan, I think they want to see how the rezoning goes with discussion of the overall frontage. The preliminary comments we got from them was that there would have to be a fire hydrant placed at a location to be determined after they did a more in depth study.

What we have done is to use the planned zoning to limit the amount of risk on the proposed lots. The lots in question tonight are the two vacant lots that are currently zoned R-S. Regarding transportation, the Nettles and Vomunds have agreed that the number of driveways be limited to three total for the three lots. Our proposal was to merge the driveway and not have one on the adjacent lot; or put in a common drive and cover whatever the staff requires if any easements are necessary.

Chad Sayre: Stormwater has been the subject of most of our conversations. We were lucky enough to be at the homeowner's association meeting, we did meet with them at length, they were very gracious and have given a lot of feedback. We were there the same night as Georganne Bowman (from Boone County Resource Management) was to discuss their stormwater issues in Sunrise Estates and the stormwater grant. We believe we have done the preliminary planning necessary to show that we can be compliant with the current Boone County Stormwater Regulations. There are some existing Stormwater issues in this area and there may be some additional requirements that have to be met. Our job was to show enough preliminary design to show feasibility and place that on the lot for the Commission to review and make sure that everyone knows that the preliminary design will fit on the lot and still leave the lot in a condition that is still useable for the owners.

Mr. Sayre pointed out on the review plan the areas set aside for stormwater.

Chad Sayre: There may have to be some agreements and things to be worked out with the Planning and Zoning staff. The applicants agree with staff conditions. We don't believe it is feasible for these to lots to be residential in this corridor. The applicants believe that with this type of design and buffer it won't make the noise higher or make it visually worse than it is being adjacent to I-70.

Mr. Sayre indicated locations of the buffer on the plan.

Chad Sayre: We will be building a berm trying to use the top soil on site and we will be constructing a barrier fence. One of the neighbors specifically requested a vinyl fence and the applicants have agreed. The fence will go along the southern edge of the proposed parking and display lot; it is also proposed to be extended up the east side. On the west side is the existing building, it is a 38,000 square foot building and the property is zoned C-G where there is more parking lot proposed. We have some final design work to do as we go through this; we believe we have performed enough analysis to show that our preliminary findings are all feasible and we will comply with those.

Commissioner Freiling: The stormwater detention that the applicants have proposed to build; does the runoff from this lot currently impact any of the neighborhood to the south?

Chad Sayre: The way this current lot is the only parking area that exists is on the existing lot; the stormwater from it runs off in to the ditch.

Commissioner Freiling: So the long term impact from those retention basins will be to reduce whatever impact there is downstream.

Chad Sayre: That is correct. The Public Works Engineer mentioned that if we could get an easement there might have to be a pipe extended but that involves three county culverts and might involve the elimination of the lagoon. Currently the berms of the lagoon restricts us on the amount of fall we can get in the stormwater system.

Open to public hearing:

Present, speaking in favor:

Joe Vomund, 35178 Audrain County Road 746, Martinsburg
Paula Vomund, 35178 Audrain County Road 746, Martinsburg

Joe Vomund: I own the property and it was the home of Diamond Furniture for about 15 years. Part of the success of the business was due to the location between the two exits. We had a lot of trucks in and out of there, we made deliveries in and out of there as well. We have owned the property for close to 20 years. I support the Nettles and their business, it is an ideal location.

Commissioner Murphy: What type business is proposed?

Joe Vomund: Commercial truck bodies.

Commissioner Murphy: Manufacturing or selling?

Joe Vomund: They will repair and resale some.

Commissioner Murphy: Will it be a display lot?

Joe Vomund: Yes.

Commissioner Murphy: Have the owners ever tried to sell the lots?

Joe Vomund: We have had the building for sale for quite a while.

Commissioner Murphy: Have the owners tried to market the lots as residential lots?

Joe Vomund: No.

Present, speaking in favor:

Julie Nettles, 1610 Andretti Circle, Columbia.

Julie Nettles: I am the co-owner of Commercial Truck Body & Paint. We have had the business since 2007 it is currently located on Rangeline Road which is right down the road from the proposed location. The main reason we want to move is for the I-70 exposure. The lot itself is for parking; a lot of times the vehicles will come in and have a trailer, they will need to drop their trailer so we can work on their truck. The parking close to the existing building is not going to suit that. We also have equipment for sale occasionally. Most of the things we are working on are in the shop and that is for our own security and for the customers security. We would like to stay in the Boone County area; we are outgrowing the building we have now. Having been in this profession for 10 to 15 years, we recognize that area as very beneficial for the business; we hope to add at least 33% more employees in the first year if things go as we anticipate.

Chairperson Harris: How big of a facility do you have now?

Julie Nettles: The existing building is 8,000 square feet.

Present, neutral party:

Andrew Timbrook, 740 N. East Park, Columbia.

Andrew Timbrook: I think this business has the potential to be a good thing if it is done right as far as stormwater runoff. I know there are neighbors with concerns about chemicals that are going to be used. I also realize there are codes in place to give guidance. I would like to see some caveats put in the plan as far as stormwater runoff, what kind of pavement will be put in, and things like that. One thing I will say in support, there is no way anyone will ever build a house there. I live a block and a half off of the interstate and I still hear too much vehicle noise, there is no way anyone will want a residence there. There is a home on the corner that in the seven years I have lived in the subdivision its been inhabited by at least four different families. I don't know if that is traffic related but I would say it is a contributing factor. I have heard good things about how the applicants keep their existing site and I would say it is a good thing if it is done right. In regard to the lagoon, the stormwater runs off under the road and to go around the lagoon it has to make two 90 degree turns, if they are willing to do something with that to take care of the storm water it could be another area of improvement as well as if they did a permeable type asphalt where the water can drain through. If there are caveats in there it could be a good thing.

Present, speaking in opposition:

Robert Tripp, President, Homeowners Association, 660 N West Park Lane, Columbia

Robert Tripp: I have had people express concerns and complaints. One person said she is not in favor of changing any residential areas to commercial; she would rather preserve the residential character of the area of the neighborhood. Another said the neighborhood has drainage problems and it is loud enough with I-70 and doesn't want the noise increased or chemical pollution. There was also an objection to paint fumes. I tried to assure the lady that because of regulations they are probably well within code and using charcoal filters in the paint booth. There was a complaint of having wrecked vehicles parked on the lot; this can be a detriment as far as the aesthetic value of the subdivision. There was another concern about screening of wrecked vehicles. When one comes in that would give the appearance of a junk yard rather than a body shop unless it is moved indoors right a way. We feel screening would be necessary, I am not sure a screen from the south would be necessary due to the fact that the plan is to put a berm there with a privacy fence on top of it; that should be more than adequate to screen the building from the subdivision. My suggestion would be to screen from the outer road and the east side of the property to block off the appearance of wrecked vehicles. I was not aware it would also be a sales lot for vehicles; naturally this would be a used vehicle lot. I was in hopes it would be a wrecked vehicle that was rebuilt and parked out there, this could be a detriment as far as our subdivision is concerned.

Vice-Chairperson Freiling: (to audience) How many people in the audience live in the subdivision and are opposed to the request?

Approximately five people raised their hands.

Closed to public hearing.

Chad Sayre: We have opened up the pervious pavement aspects of this. We have left that fairly open with several different options and the reason is because we have to address some things in the final design. It is going to have to be a combination of permeable areas and storage below pavement; from the quality aspects of things, our stormwater expert addressed that on the notes. There will be several different things that are done.

Robert Tripp: We really aren't too concerned about the stormwater runoff due to the fact that they have shown willingness to work with the county to facilitate this so that is not a major concern.

Chad Sayre: Georganne Bowman has made it clear that she is going to make us from the beginning; our timing was great to be there during the stormwater meeting. I don't believe that property is feasible as R-S, if it were, I don't believe there are stormwater controls near as stringent as there is with CG-P. If someone wanted to build a house there and put .8 acres of parking lot around their house they can; it is an existing platted lot. I don't believe the land use currently there is not the highest and best use. The applicants have spent a lot of time and effort and they have a paint booth; there is a building code and I believe that is all being reviewed.

Julie Nettles: We have a paint booth; we brought it brand new in 2007, it is a self contained paint booth, there are filters throughout and has its own fire suppression system. The paint is inside there and we don't even know when they are painting because we can't hear or smell it.

Chad Sayre: We have tried to address screening issues in the preliminary plan. We got more feedback from Uriah today that there may be internal screening. There may be an area that is designated at the lower part of the lot, we drop off about 14 feet from the outer road. The outer road has been the most concerns that I have felt we have gotten as what is perceived there. The Nettles have planned to invest quite a bit of money in the exterior. Overall we had requests for fencing along the outer road and at the same homeowners association meeting we had requests for no fencing. Their hours are limited; they aren't a 24 hour operation so there is no need for any big lighting. We feel the easterly and southerly screening will be a significant barrier; I am not going to say there will be a decrease in noise but I don't think there will be an increase. There will be vehicles that will have damage; they do a lot of work on Semi's, RV's, and Busses. It is a multi-level building and they will have sales of components. Part of the reason they will have some small vehicles is the employees and also they hope to sell specialty parts out of the front of the building.

Julie Nettles: If you go by our shop now you will not see wrecked vehicles outside. It doesn't make sense for us to leave vehicles that are wrecked outside because of theft and further damage from weather. When we get a vehicle in it may sit outside for a few minutes while we make a space for it inside. With this new building we will have more room to pull them in. The only things we leave outside now are jobs that are completed and those waiting for customer pickup. If a semi comes in and they've got a load we need to work on a bumper he will just park a trailer and bring his truck inside. We don't let wrecked vehicles sit outside for any extended period of time.

Commissioner Poehlman: What are the hours of operation?

Julie Nettles: 8:00 to 5:00 and we don't work weekends, occasionally we will have some guys come in to finish up a hot item or they may work until 6:00 pm to finish up a job.

Commissioner Murphy: What is the list of proposed uses?

Chad Sayre: Parking lot and display lot. Any changes other than that will have to come back to the Commission.

Commissioner Morrison: What kind of lighting will be on the display lot?

Chad Sayre: Very minimal, dusk to dawn lights; I think there are two now and we may add an additional one.

Chairperson Harris: Do the applicants anticipate any lighting on the new lots?

Chad Sayre: I didn't look at the architectural plans but I anticipate there will be wall packs on the door entries. I anticipate there will be lighting but it will be on the existing building.

Chairperson Harris: The applicant is not anticipating any pole lighting on the far east end?

Chad Sayre: No, and if they want to put in lights it could either come to administrative approval or it would have to come back to the Commission.

Thad Yonke: There is a clause on the plan that says the lighting will be installed on existing lighting poles. Since that is a specific provision it would have to come back to the Commission for any changes.

Uriah Mach: Some of the discussion has been directed at the C-G zoned lot; with this proposal we can't review anything in regard to the actual lot that has a building on it. There is a lot of anxiety from the community on that; unfortunately the commission can not do anything about that. This request is for the parking and display lot; what they do with the C-G zoned lot lies solely on the building code. The existing lot was mentioned in the staff report because it is a critical aspect in understanding this request.

Chairperson Harris: One of the first concerns was appearance because we don't want a salvage yard out there. I have been by the applicant's existing operation and I passed it before I realized where it was. It doesn't show to be what it is. If someone brings in a wrecked vehicle logistically would that get parked on the lots that are subject to the rezoning request? In looking at it looks as though it would more likely go on the west side of the building by the shop doors.

Julie Nettles: Generally when we get a wrecked vehicle it goes right in to the shop. We can't leave the vehicle out in the weather.

Uriah Mach: That is one of the conditions; they are not allowed to store or park any damaged or destroyed vehicles.

Chairperson Harris: How deep are the detention basins?

Chad Sayre: What we are showing is four to five feet deep. We did offer to work with Georganne Bowman on a rain garden but it would be on the C-G lot.

Chairperson Harris: The private sewer lines serving lot 106 clips across the southeast corner.

Uriah Mach: That is correct, according to the sewer district there is a private line that clips the lot. All the sewer district wants is an easement to protect the lines.

Commissioner Poehlman: If the applicants sell the property it can continue to be used as a display/parking lot. Could the detention ponds be altered any?

Uriah Mach: Not without a plan revision.

Commissioner Poehlman: But the usage on top of it could change.

Uriah Mach: No, any change other than a display lot or parking lot would need a new plan with a new public process and full review by staff and the Commission.

Thad Yonke: But someone could put in a used car lot because it is parking and display.

Commissioner Murphy: There has been discussion about putting screening along the outer road; what about between the south fence and the lot? Is there enough grading in there?

Chad Sayre: We are getting as much benefit from the build up of the berm; it keeps us from having to haul top soil that we will have to strip for any parking that is phased in. We anticipate looking at quantities of around four feet. It would have a fence on it and some tree planting in between the end of any work that we do and the existing lots to the south. It is going to be all the way across the southern part of the lot and across the east.

Commissioner Freiling: Part of our function is to protect Boone County. In this instance, in this location, given the wide range of things that could have happened with the existing lot the neighbors are fortunate with the nature, attitude, and ability of the proposed buyer to try and make this as neighborhood friendly as possible. Those are not residential lots and if something were built there as residential it would be rental property. Its not that I think the neighbors should be thrilled but there is room to be relieved that the use of the lot, as proposed, is very restricted and less intrusive than about any other proposed use I can think of.

Commissioner Freiling made and Commissioner Poehlman seconded a motion to **approve** the request by Joseph and Paula Vomund on behalf of Corey Nettles to rezone from R-S (Single Family Residential) to C-GP (Planned General Commercial) located adjacent to 7400 E I-70 Drive SE, Columbia.

Boyd Harris – Yes

Carl Freiling – Yes

Gregory Martin – Yes

Michael Morrison – Yes

Paul Prevo – Yes

Michael Poehlman – Yes

Eric Kurzejeski – Yes

Kevin Murphy – Yes

Motion to approve request passes unanimously

Commissioner Murphy made and Commissioner Prevo seconded a motion to **approve** the request by Joseph and Paula Vomund on behalf of Corey Nettles to approve a Review Plan on 1.82 acres, more or less, being lots 125 and 126 of the Replat of Sunrise Estates Subdivision, located adjacent to 7400 E I-70 Drive SE, Columbia **with the following conditions:**

1. That fire protection issues are resolved to the satisfaction of the Boone County Fire Protection District prior to approval of the final plan
2. That easements be created to cover the private sewer line that serves lots 106 & 107 to the east of the subject tract.
3. The parking area cannot be gravel and must be a dust-free hard surface to minimize off-site impacts to the surrounding residential neighborhood.
4. That no junked, damaged, or inoperable vehicles will be stored on this parking/display lot.

Boyd Harris – Yes	Carl Freiling – Yes
Gregory Martin – Yes	Michael Morrison – Yes
Paul Prevo – Yes	Michael Poehlman – Yes
Eric Kurzejeski – Yes	Kevin Murphy – Yes

Motion to approve request passes unanimously

Chairperson Harris informed the applicant that this request would go before the County Commission on May 3, 2011 and the applicants need to be present.

VII. Planned Developments

None.

VIII. Plats

1. River Look. S16-T45N-R11W. A-2. William D. Rotts, owner. Brian David Dollar, surveyor.

The following staff report was entered in to the record:

The subject property is located on Soft Pit Hill Road, east of Slate Creek Road, approximately 1 mile southeast of Hartsburg. The proposal splits an 8.44 acre lot from a 37 acre parent parcel. There is currently a house and wastewater lagoon on the property. The property is zoned A-2 (Agriculture) and is surrounded by A-2 zoning. This is all original 1973 zoning.

The lot has direct access on to Soft Pit Hill Road, a county-maintained public road. The applicant has submitted a request to waive the required traffic study.

Consolidated Public Water Service District #1 provides public water to the existing house. Boone Electric provides electrical service. The Southern Boone County Fire Protection District provides fire protection to this property.

An existing on-site wastewater system provides wastewater treatment for this property. The applicant has submitted a request to waive the required wastewater cost-benefit analysis.

The property scored 36 points on the rating system.

Staff recommends approval of the plat and granting the requested waivers.

No one present to represent the plat.

Commissioner Prevo made and Commissioner Murphy seconded a motion to **approve** River Look with waivers.

Boyd Harris – Yes

Carl Freiling – Yes

Gregory Martin – Yes

Michael Morrison – Yes

Paul Prevo – Yes

Michael Poehlman – Yes

Eric Kurzejeski – Yes

Kevin Murphy – Yes

Motion to approve the plat carries unanimously.

IX. Old Business

1. Update on County Commission Action.

Stan Shawver updated the Planning and Zoning Commission of the decisions made by the County Commission.

The Naugle rezoning request was approved as recommended.

X. New Business

1. Highway 63 Corridor

The County Commission had mentioned the Highway 63 south corridor being the next place for a sub-area plan. Since that time MoDot decided they wanted to put in new southbound lanes from Discovery Ridge interchange down to the airport and they are going to put in an interchange at the airport. The current southbound lanes on Highway 63 will become the outer road. The Commission thinks it might be time to begin working on that sub area plan. We would want to involve the City of Columbia and the City of Ashland. The Planning and Zoning Commission is scheduled for their next meeting with the County Commission at the May work session.

This is an important project, however the road isn't going to be built overnight. In that sense the commission should be realistic in their time schedule. It is something we need to figure out how we want to do it and what the parameters are.

Chairperson Harris asked that a preliminary plan be available at the work session so they could discuss it with the Commissioners to get an idea of what the boundaries might be so they can get started.

XI. Adjourn

Being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary
Michael Morrison

Minutes approved on this 19th day of May 2011