

BOONE COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

BOONE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
ROOM 214, 801 E. WALNUT ST, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
(573) 886-4330

Minutes

7:00 P.M.

Thursday, February 20, 2025

I. CALL TO ORDER

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
 - Gregory Martin, Secretary Katy Township
 - Kevin Harvey Rock Bridge Township
 - Christy Schnarre Bourbon Township
 - Jeff McCann County Engineer
- b. Attending by Phone:
 - Steve Koirtyohann Rocky Fork Township
 - Randall Trecha Cedar Township
 - Jeffrey Ehimuh Columbia Township
- c. Absent:
 - Eric Kurzejeski, Vice Chairperson Missouri Township
 - Ken Butler Perche Township
 - Robert Schrieber Three Creeks Township
- d. Staff Present:
 - Bill Florea, Director Thad Yonke, Senior Planner
 - Uriah Mach, Planner Andrew Devereux, Planner
 - Paula Evans, Staff

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes from the December 19, 2024, meeting were approved as presented by acclamation.

IV. CHAIRPERSON STATEMENT

Chairperson Harris entered the following statement into the record:

The February 20, 2025, meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission is now called to order.

Notice of this meeting has been posted in accordance with State and local laws.

The Boone County Planning and Zoning Commission is an advisory commission to the County Commission and makes recommendations on matters dealing with land use. The commission is made up of individuals representing each township of the county and the county engineer.

The Planning and Zoning Commission may follow Robert's Rules of Order or its own by-laws. The by-laws provide that all members of the commission, including the chairperson, enjoy full privileges of the floor and may debate, vote upon, or make any motion.

The following procedure will be followed:

Announcement of each agenda item will be followed by a report from the planning department staff. After the staff report, the applicant or their representative may make a presentation to the Commission. Then, the floor will be opened for a public hearing. Those wishing to speak in support of the request will be allowed to speak, then the floor will be given over to those opposed to the request. Individuals that neither support nor oppose a request may address the commission at any time during the public hearing.

Please direct all comments or questions to the commission. Be concise and restrict your comments to the matter under discussion. We ask that you please not be repetitious with your remarks. Some issues can be quite emotional but please be considerate of everyone and refrain from applause, cheers, or other signs of support or displeasure.

Please give your name and mailing address when you address the commission and sign the sheet on the table after you testify. We ask that you turn off or silence 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. If you would like to recover original material, please see the staff during regular business hours.

After the public hearing is closed no further comments will be permitted from the audience unless requested by the Commission. The applicant will have an opportunity to respond to any concerns expressed during the public hearing. Next the staff will be given an opportunity for any additional comments. The commission will then discuss the matter, and a motion will be made for a recommendation to the County Commission.

All recommendations for approval are forwarded to the County Commission. They will conduct another public hearing on Tuesday, March 11, 2025, at 7:00 PM. Interested parties will be able to comment on the requests at that time. The vote on discretionary items, such as rezonings and conditional use permits will not be taken at that hearing; those items will be scheduled for a second reading at a future date; the date and location of the second reading will be announced at the meeting on the 11th. The County Commission generally follows the recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission; however, they are not obligated to do so.

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. There will be no further public notification due to the short time between the hearing tonight and the County Commission hearing.

The Boone County Zoning and Subdivision Regulations are hereby made a part of the record of these proceedings.

V. REZONING REQUESTS

- 1. Request by Mary Williams on behalf of Sinclair & Heather Lester to rezone from Agriculture 2 (A-2) and Recreation (REC) to A-2 on 7.07 acres located at 7601 W Hwy 124, Harrisburg. (open public hearing)**

Planner, Andrew Devereux informed the Commission that Ms. Williams was in an auto-accident and unable to attend this evening and requested that this item be tabled until the March 20, 2025 meeting.

Chairperson Harris made, and Commissioner Harvey seconded a motion to table the request by Mary Williams on behalf of Sinclair & Heather Lester to rezone from Agriculture 2 (A-2) and Recreation (REC) to A-2 on 7.07 acres located at 7601 W Hwy 124, Harrisburg:

Boyd Harris – Yes	Greg Martin – Yes
Steve Koirtyohann – Yes	Randal Trecha – Yes
Kevin Harvey – Yes	Christy Schnarre – Yes
Jeffrey Ehimuh – Yes	Jeff McCann – Yes

Motion to table the rezoning request passes unanimously. Item tabled until the March 20, 2025 meeting.

VI. PLATS

Plats 1 – 5 were placed on consent agenda

1. McHatton Subdivision. A-2. S13-T51N-R13W. J and F Farms LLC, owner. Kevin Schweikert, surveyor.

The following staff report was entered into the record:

The subject property is located approximately 300' east of the intersection of N HWY 63 and E McHatton Rd. The property is 83.50 acres in size, and zoned Agriculture 2 (A-2). The surrounding zoning is as follows:

- North – A-2
- East – A-2
- South – A-2
- East, across N HWY 63 – Agriculture-Residential (A-R)

The property is currently undeveloped. The proposal is to subdivide three platted lots ranging between 5 and 6.90 acres in size, all with road frontage along E McHatton Rd. The remaining acreage of the parent property will be subdivided into six separate tracts via administrative survey.

The subject property has direct access onto E McHatton Rd, a publicly dedicated roadway. The applicants have submitted a written request for a waiver from the traffic study requirement. Creation of a three-lot minor plat is unlikely to have a significant impact on existing transportation infrastructure. Granting a waiver from the traffic study requirement is appropriate in this case.

The subject property is located within Public Water Supply District #10 service area. Boone Electric provides power service. The Boone County Fire Protection District provides fire protection in the area. The nearest station, Station 6, is approximately 4.2 miles away.

The applicant has proposed the use of onsite wastewater lagoons for future single-family dwellings. An onsite wastewater plan was submitted concurrent to the plat showing potential lagoon locations compliant

with minimum setback requirements. The applicant has submitted a written request for a waiver from the sewer cost benefit analysis requirement. No nearby publicly operated sewer system is available nearby. Creation of a three-lot minor plat is unlikely to be feasible in creation of a new public sewer system. Granting a waiver from the sewer cost benefit analysis is appropriate in this case.

The property scored 17 points on the rating system

Staff recommend approval of the plat and granting of waivers.

2. Hinton Lake Estates. R-S. S1-T49N-R13W. Higbee Lake Investments LLC, owner. Kevin Schweikert, surveyor.

The following staff report was entered into the record:

The subject property is located approximately 3 miles north of the City of Columbia, at the northeastern corner of the intersection of Hinton Road and State Highway VV. The property is 38.75 acres in size and zoned Residential Single-Family (R-S). The property has one house and two large water features, one pond and a part of a larger lake, present. The surrounding zoning is as follows:

- North & West – Agriculture-Residential (A-R)
- East – A-R & R-S
- South – R-S

This plat creates an 8-lot subdivision, with lots ranging in size from 1.86 acres to 15.30 acres. The 15.30-acre lot has the larger lake, and the 5.45-acre lot has the pond and existing house.

The property has direct access on to 2 publicly dedicated and publicly maintained roads, Hinton Road and State Highway VV. Lots 1-5 will use access to Hinton Road with new driveway permits through Boone County Public Works, and lots 6-8 will have access to State Route VV through Missouri Department of Transportation Access Control.

Water to the site is provided by Consolidated Public Water Service District #1, with a 6" line on Hinton Road and an 8" line on Route VV. Fire Hydrants will be required to the satisfaction of the Director of Resource Management and the Boone County Fire Protection District.

This development is proposed to be served by central sewer provided by the Boone County Regional Sewer District. Plans have been submitted to the Sewer District and they are under review.

The property scored 66 points on the rating system.

Staff recommend approval of this final plat.

3. Bluebird Acres. A-2. S24-T47N-R13W. Corey Myers Construction LLC, owner. Frederick Carroz, surveyor.

The following staff report was entered into the record:

The subject property is located off E Bluebird Ln, approximately ½ mile east of the intersection of S RTE N and E Bluebird Ln. The property is 10.13 acres in size and zoned Agriculture 2 (A-2). The surrounding zoning is all A-2. An existing house, onsite wastewater lagoon, and storage sheds are present on the property. The proposal is to subdivide the property into two lots. The existing home, wastewater lagoon, and storage sheds will be contained on lot 1. Lot 2 will be vacant.

The subject property has direct road frontage onto E Bluebird Ln, a publicly maintained roadway. The applicant has not filed a request for a waiver from the traffic study requirement. Creation of a single additional source of traffic onto E Bluebird Ln is likely to have a minimal impact on transpiration resources. Granting a waiver of the traffic study requirement is appropriate in this case.

The property is located within Consolidated Public Water Supply District 1 service area. Boone Electric provides power service. The Boone County Fire Protection District provides fire protection. The nearest station, station 8, is approximately 5.8 miles away.

The applicant has proposed a subsurface wastewater system to serve the eventual residential development on lot 2. Soils data from a soils scientist was provided showing two potential locations for an engineered subsurface wastewater system. The applicant has not requested a waiver from the sewer cost benefit analysis. However, the nearest public sewer system at Brookfield Estates has already had its existing capacity allocated to other users. The creation of an additional buildable lot is unlikely to have a major impact on the creation of a new public sewer system. Granting a waiver to the sewer cost benefit analysis is appropriate in this case.

The property scored 19 points on the rating system

Staff recommends approval of the plat and granting of waivers.

4. Wendser Manor. A-2. S24-T47N-R13W. Wendling Development LLC, owner. Kevin Schweikert, surveyor.

The following staff report was entered into the record:

The subject property is located off S RTE N, approximately 340' northeast of the intersection of S RTE N and W Stanley Poe Rd. The subject property is 41.51 acres in size and is zoned Agriculture 2 (A-2). The property is surrounded by A-2 zoning on all sides. An existing single-family dwelling, onsite wastewater lagoon, and several accessory storage buildings are present on the property. The proposal seeks to subdivide the property into five lots, with a corresponding administrative survey for the 14-acre remainder not included within the plat.

The subject property has direct road frontage along S RTE N. A private access easement will provide access to S RTE N for the subdivision lots that do not have direct road frontage. MoDOT has indicated that the proposed private access easement will meet regulations for sight distance. The applicant has submitted a request for a waiver from the traffic study requirement. Approval of the plat will create four new potential traffic sources once fully developed with single family dwellings. This development will likely have a minimal impact on existing transportation infrastructure. Granting a waiver to the traffic study requirement is appropriate in this case.

Consolidated Water Supply District #1 provides water service in the area. Boone Electric provides power service. Boone County Fire Protection District provides fire protection. The nearest station, Station 8, is approximately 5.7 miles away. Fire protection in the form of fire hydrants will be required as part of the plat. The Fire District has indicated that they have given preliminary approval for a hydrant location.

The applicant has proposed on site wastewater lagoons to serve the future residential development. An onsite wastewater plan with compliant lagoon locations was submitted concurrent to the plat. The applicant has submitted a request for a waiver from the sewer cost benefit analysis. No publicly operated sewer is available. Creation of a five-lot plat is unlikely to be a large enough scale for a publicly operated sewer facility. Granting a waiver to the sewer cost benefit analysis is appropriate in this case.

An existing house is located within the private access easement and designated as “house to be removed” on the face of the plat. The house must be removed before the plat can be received and accepted to ensure unincumbered access to and from S RTE N.

The property scored 28 points on the rating system

Staff recommends approval of the plat and granting of waivers with the following conditions:

1. Installation of a fire hydrant or hydrants is completed to the satisfaction of Consolidated Water, Boone County Fire Protection District, and the Director of Resource Management before the plat is received and accepted by the County Commission.
2. The house designated to be removed on the plat is demolished, and all associated debris is removed before the plat is received and accepted by the County Commission.

5. Locust Grove Subdivision, Plat 3. A-2P. S1-T48N-R14W. Perry Luetkemeyer, owner. David Borden, surveyor.

The following staff report was entered into the record:

The subject property is located approximately 500-feet west of Locust Grove Church Road and is accessed by a private drive serving several lots. The subject property is in the Midway area approximately 500-feet Northwest of the intersection of Locust Grove Church Road and Henderson Road. This plat reconfigures the 9.94-acres comprised of an existing platted lot and one other parcel into two platted lots that will comply with the approved final development plan. A waiver of a traffic study and waiver of cost benefit analysis for central sewer are appropriate in this instance

The property is zoned Planned Agriculture 2 (A-2P) which was rezoned from Residential Single Family (R-S) in October 2024. This is a phase of a major plat. The two lots of this plat are served by a private access easement. The home on lot 1A has completed installation of a new wastewater lagoon. Fire protection is required for this plat. We have correspondence from Consolidated Public Water District #1 that the water infrastructure and hydrant have been installed and are acceptable. The property scored 69 points on the rating system.

Staff recommends approval along with the granting of waivers.

Commissioner Harvey made, and Commissioner Schnarre seconded a motion to approve the plats on consent agenda as recommended:

Boyd Harris – Yes
Steve Koirtyohann – Yes
Kevin Harvey – Yes
Jeffrey Ehimuh – Yes

Greg Martin – Yes
Randal Trecha – Yes
Christy Schnarre – Yes
Jeff McCann – Yes

Motion to approve the plats passes unanimously

Chairperson Harris stated that plats eligible to go before the County Commission will do so on Tuesday, March 11, 2025 at 7:00 PM.

6. Nature Trail Ranchettes Plat 2A. A-2. S19&24-T49N-R14W. Alta Vista Properties, LLC, owner. David Borden, surveyor.

The following staff report was entered into the record:

Summary Denial of Nature Trail Ranchettes Plat 2A

The proposed plat of Nature Trail Ranchettes Plat 2 A is procedurally defective and must be denied. County Subdivision Regulations Section 1.8 establish procedures for vacating and replatting land that has been previously platted. Those procedures require two preliminary steps: a Request to Vacate the currently approved plat and Request for Approval of a Replat Concept. Both of those steps require approval from the County Commission before a final replat can be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

A vacation request for this property was denied by the County Commission in May of 2022. The applicant was reminded of that fact and informed by email dated 01/21/2025 & 02/09/2025 (attached comment sheet) and by phone call that a vacation approval by the County Commission is required prior to approval of a replat by P&Z.

The only relevant fact in this matter is whether the County Commission has approved the vacation and replat concept for this property. Since those approvals were denied by the County Commission, the plat must be denied.

Commissioner Harvey made, and Chairperson Harris seconded a motion to deny Nature Trail Ranchettes Plat 2A:

Boyd Harris – Yes	Greg Martin – Yes
Steve Koirtyohann – Yes	Randal Trecha – Yes
Kevin Harvey – Yes	Christy Schnarre – Yes
Jeffrey Ehimuh – Yes	Jeff McCann – Yes

Motion to deny the plat passes unanimously

VII. OLD BUSINESS

- 1. Request by Ana Lee Grone Revocable Living Trust to rezone from Agriculture 1 (A-1) to Planned Light Industrial (M-LP) and to approve a review plan and preliminary plat for Grone Subdivision on 36.12 acres located at 2115 Rte Z, Columbia. (No public hearing; public hearing took place at the December 19, 2024 meeting).**

Commissioner Harvey made, and Commissioner Schnarre seconded a motion to remove the request by Ana Lee Grone Revocable Living Trust from the table:

Boyd Harris – Yes	Greg Martin – Yes
Steve Koirtyohann – Yes	Randal Trecha – Yes
Kevin Harvey – Yes	Christy Schnarre – Yes
Jeffrey Ehimuh – Yes	Jeff McCann – Yes

Motion to remove the request from the table passes unanimously

The following minutes from December 19, 2024 are entered into the record.

Italics are minutes from December 19, 2024 meeting.

Senior Planner, Thad Yonke gave the following staff report:

The subject property is located on the south side of St. Charles Road and the west side of State Route Z, approximately 300 feet south of the Roundabout intersection. The overall property is 36.31-acres in size and is zoned Agriculture 1 (A-1). This is an original 1973 zoning, as are most of the surrounding zonings with the exceptions noted below.

- *North – Residential Single-Family (R-S) & A-1*
- *Northeast – Agriculture – Residential (A-R)*
- *East – A-R*
- *Southeast – Light Industrial (M-L) rezoned in 2009*
- *South – Planned Recreational (Rec- P) rezoned in 2017 & A-1*
- *Southwest – Agriculture 2 (A-2)*
- *West – A-2*
- *Northwest – Planned Single-Family Residential (R-SP) rezoned in 2018*

The property is vacant. The proposed use is for a 36-acre heavy equipment contractor compound with buildings and lay-down/equipment/materials yard. The maximum amount of office space is limited to 4800 square feet for the site. This office area is part of a single proposed building that will be a maximum of 43,200 square feet, including the office component. The remainder of this building is proposed for a vehicle maintenance shop which is to be constructed in two phases. Additional proposed structures include several pole barns comprising 13,250 square feet, and a wash-bay building that has not been dimensioned but scales to 6000 square feet, and 20+ acres of paved contractors' yard for materials and equipment.

The property to the north and northwest is in the process of being developed as Willow Creek, a residential planned development of around 200-250 units with a variety of housing units from cottages, single-family, and two-family dwellings. The first phase of this development has been approved and has houses that have been completed and sold with others under construction. The next phase of Willow Creek in the approval process is immediately north, across St. Charles Road, from this proposal. Additionally, Lee Heights is a longstanding residential subdivision of a dozen or so houses that shares a property line with the proposal and likely will be the most impacted by the new development.

This request is in the Northeast Area Transportation Plan and therefore, if approved, is subject to a transportation fee associated with the development's impact.

The Master Plan designates a sufficiency of resources test for the evaluation of zoning changes where each proposal is evaluated to see if sufficient utility, transportation, and public safety infrastructure is in place to support the change in zoning. Failure to pass the test should result in denial of a request. Success in passing the test should result in further analysis.

Utilities: The property is in Public Water Supply District #9. There is a 12-inch water main along the eastern property line along Route Z and some water improvements may be needed for the site. Boone Electric Cooperative provides service to the site and area. The Boone County Fire Protection District (BCFPD) has indicated that the project will need to meet commercial fire flows. Initial wastewater service is proposed to be from the Boone County Regional Sewer District (BCRSD), connecting into the residential development to the north across St. Charles Road with only a limited capacity secured for this project. However, the property is subject to a sewer agreement between the BCRSD and City of Columbia that designates this property as a City of Columbia customer. An annexation agreement between the City and the developer is required and is being worked on but has not worked out all the issues.

A gravity city sewer line is being extended for another project that will be able to provide direct gravity sewer in the near future. Should this proposal be approved, connection for the site to the gravity sewer for the proposed washdown system and any other sanitary sewer uses in the future need to connect to this gravity sewer. As a planned public sewer, it is likely, the site would not qualify for on-site wastewater under County rules except as a temporary system. The Stormwater plan and improvements are proposed to all be installed as part of phase 1 for the total buildout of the site despite some of these facilities seeming to be outside of the designated phase 1 area. This is another inconsistency in the proposal that needs to be clarified.

Transportation: The property has frontage on two publicly maintained roadways and one future public roadway. The site design currently proposes one entrance upon Route Z and one onto St. Charles Road. The use itself will introduce permanent heavy equipment traffic to the area which, at a minimum, will access the proposed truck wash. Large vehicles with deliveries of materials in and out will now be commonplace. The frequency and addition of a different kind of traffic, heavy equipment traffic, does not seem to be addressed in the traffic study with enough detail as to a possible maximum volume or intensity that could occur under the allowed use as requested.

With over 20-acres of paved yard, there is no inherent limitation on intensity of use or limit of potential overuse built into the request as an enforceable limitation based on anything but an initial stated number of employees. This number, which is significantly less than can be reasonably accommodated by a 43,200 square foot maximum main building, makes reliance upon a proposed employee number an unusable standard in this case. One must assume that if approved, over time the intensity of this use will continue to expand to utilize and maximize the development area as intensively as allowed under the approval of the site. A different contractor or changed business mode could see the number of employees at the site increase dramatically with no further review.

Another concern is how the permanent addition of this type of traffic will impact St. Charles Road, since it is the single source roadway that directly feeds both Battle Elementary and Battle High School. Heavy equipment traffic would be better not directly accessing St. Charles Road and should be introduced to Route Z closer to the interchange around the Clark Lane/Enterprise Drive Extension, such as on the property two properties to the south that is the same size and also owned by the same owner.

Public Safety: The property is in the Boone County Fire Protection District with the closest station being Station 1 at 2.2 miles away by roadway.

Zoning Analysis: The property is in the Northeast Area Plan which was adopted by the County Commission in 2010. The future land use map in the plan shows this area as suitable for "Mixed Small Industrial & Commercial Transition". The text component of the plan that provides the nuanced and detailed explanation of what is expected in terms of the type and characteristics of development states on page 7 in the section on Commercial Development : "...commercial development would generally be located south of existing St. Charles Road and north of the future extension of Clark Lane. Commercial uses envisioned within corridor should follow the "Neighborhood Commons concept as described in the

Metro 2020 Plan in order to support the residential neighborhoods of the plan area.” The first Goal of this section is “Develop integrated, appropriate commercial centers that contribute to the quality of life within the plan area. This proposal does not contribute to the quality of life within the plan area. This proposal shows it doesn’t meet this goal when trying to argue it has no responsibility for road improvements under a traffic study effectively saying that it is not an employment center because it only has 10 employees working the site in total. The proposed use does not produce anything an area user would consume/directly or utilize to improve their quality of life.

Under this Goal is Objective 1: Promote regional commercial centers along the Route Z corridor. Of the six strategies under this objective, only the one promoting limiting the subdivision of larger tracts is supportive of the proposal. The other strategies would all direct the proposed use further south and closer to the interchange and do not support the current proposal.

The specific use as proposed will also introduce heavy equipment traffic permanently to the area that otherwise would not be there. This use is more appropriate closer to the I-70 Route Z Interchange and not at the northernmost edge of the commercial area shown in the plan. Despite being presented as initially being “low intensity” with a limited proposed first phase with few site employees, it is the possible build-out intensity that must be weighed when considering if the use is both appropriate for the site and small in scale. What is allowed under what has been requested is neither small scale industrial as some of the supporting documentation presented claims, nor will it contribute to the quality of life within the plan area. Resource Management has also had experience with complaints from residential areas about noise from heavy equipment back-up alarms where such a use is proposed or found near a residential area. We anticipate this as a problem for which additional measures might be needed.

The Boone County Master Plan identifies this area as being suitable for residential land uses, but also acknowledges that where changes are proposed to commercial or industrial uses this should be done as a planned rezoning such as proposed here. Additionally, as a sub-area plan, the Northeast Area Plan is an updated component of the Master Plan, and it identifies this area as mentioned previously as “Mixed Small Industrial & Commercial Transition”. Some form of commercial use may be appropriate for this site to transition from the industrial park east of Route Z to the concentrated residential area across St. Charles Road and along the northern property line. This proposal doesn’t seem to be it. The proposed update to the Masterplan currently underway indicates that this would be a Regional Economic Opportunity Area, but this has not been adopted as policy at this point, and if adopted does not negate the more detailed policy of the Northeast Area Plan, which is more focused for the specific area.

Beyond the larger planning issues, there are still some major deficiencies with the proposed plan documents. The plan document incorrectly calculates the required parking and doesn’t take into account the storage buildings. The comment sheet stated the correct parking numbers to use in calculating required parking, but these were not used. No phasing plan was provided with the initial submission; only a line on a couple of the graphic pages indicating a phase 1 & phase 2. The resubmitted proposed phasing plan indicates that they want to conduct the development in multiple phases but does not provide adequate detail for any phases beyond the first phase; this discrete apportioning of the phasing must be defined now at the review plan stage and can’t be deferred to a Final Plan step. The southern property line lacks the required 25 feet perimeter setback showing only 5 feet, this is incorrect. The title in the title block and on the main graphic do not match. On sheet C2.01 the requested correction to dimension labels for the parking near the building still show contradictory information some of which does not meet county requirements. The Comment sheet indicated that the Transportation Fee analysis was needed as part of addition/clarifications to the traffic study, but this was not provided. Additional traffic information was not provided until yesterday (12/18/2024) and therefore has not been fully reviewed and has posed additional questions. The scope of the needed corrections warrant denial or at best tabling to get all technical and regulatory issues resolved.

The property scored 70 points on the rating system.

Staff recommends denial of the rezoning request and review plan because

- *it is in conflict with the adopted plans of the County,*
- *will permanently introduce heavy equipment traffic to the area, and specifically to St. Charles Rd that would otherwise not have this type of traffic as a permanent feature*
- *and because the plan document has incorrect or incomplete information shown on the plan and did not provide the information requested to address questions raised during the review process by the resubmission deadline which exists in order to provide time for proper review and analysis.*
- *No proposal as to the amount of the transportation fee attributable to this development has been proposed by the developer as this use does not directly fit the uses proposed in the study and requires a custom analysis which has not been conducted as requested. While the County sets the amount, this starting point requested of the developer but has not been provided.*

If the commission does not support denial, staff suggests there is insufficient information to support a approval and the request should be tabled to allow for corrections to the graphic and to have the applicant work with staff to address some of the outstanding questions and issues such as the quantifiable maximum extent heavy equipment traffic and the unnecessarily vague phasing plan proposed before making a final recommendation to the County Commission.

If the commission is inclined to approve the rezoning, review plan, and preliminary plat despite the deficiencies, then at a minimum the following conditions should be considered:

1. *The applicant shall prepare a new original mylar with corrections acceptable to the Director of Resource Management to address errors and deficiencies not corrected prior to the original resubmission deadline.*
2. *That the washdown wastewater and any further sewer needs are required to be treated by the City of Columbia sewer main being extended to the area and that should any on-site system be proposed/approved it would be considered temporary as there is a planned central system, such temporary use only until the new central system is available.*
3. *The proposed entrance to St. Charles Road be removed and the possibility of two entrances onto Route Z be explored. Additionally, the buffering along St. Charles be improved to mitigate noise impacts to the satisfaction of the Director of Resource Management.*
4. *Prior to submission of a Final Plan the developer proposes what they believe their transportation fee should be, based upon the methodology set out in the Northeast Area Transportation Study and then work with Staff to set the appropriate amount. A payment schedule will be a required component of compliance with this condition.*
5. *Hours of operation should be limited to Daytime Hours of Operation with no operations occurring on State Recognized Holidays.*

Present, representing the request:

Matt Kriete, *Engineering Surveys & Services, 1113 Fay St, Columbia*

After hearing the staff report, Commissioner Kurzejeski stated that with the number of deficiencies with the request, the applicant has three options, to continue and move forward this evening and maybe get a recommendation for approval with conditions, a recommendation to deny, or to table the request until the deficiencies were worked out. The applicant stated he would like to address the comments and continue this evening.

The applicant gave a presentation which is attached at the end of these minutes.

Matt Kriete: This request was first submitted in October 2024. There is still some action to be required. The applicants received consent from the Boone County Regional Sewer District to connect to their main, subject to a third-party engineer to review that, the applicants are comfortable they can make that happen. A pre-annexation agreement was filed with the city and the applicants will have to come back with a Final Plan. The property is adjacent to industrial zoning and is in an area of industrial and heavy commercial uses. The property is located on the northern edge of an industrial area. The property is adjacent American Outdoor Brands to the southeast, it is also located next to several major roadways; Route Z and St. Charles Road and a new planned collector, it also has quick access to I-70.

The preliminary plat complies with County land use regulations, is consistent with the master plan and complies with the Major Thoroughfare Plan. Right-of-way easements have been dedicated along St. Charles Road and easements have been provided on the west side in a way that the road can be constructed. Electric, fiber and gas are available on site; there is a 12-inch waterline onsite and there will be great pressure and flow to meet fire demands. Sanitary sewer is on site and it is capable of serving the development. There will be a total of 10 full-time employees which, for the demand on sanitary needs, is the equivalent of one house; the employees are working the typical business hours.

We are directly adjacent to two emergency service routes. This development will not cause traffic congestion and we have adequate site distance; we have semi-trucks coming in and out of here and there will be equipment being delivered at times. The driveways are positioned in a location that adequate site distance can be provided. Staff recommended we have two driveways on Route Z, that is unsafe, that was our intent initially, but we can't provide two safe driveways on Route Z; the location noted is the only adequate location on Route Z for the vehicles coming in and out of the site.

We need two access points; this is a safety issue, and we have committed to the neighbors in our public meeting that St. Charles will be a locked entrance and is just there if needed, but the main traffic is going to be on Route Z. We have future plans for a new driveway when the new collector is built. I believe parking is compliant. We have people using the maintenance building, the office, and the wash bay; the pole barns are like an agricultural lean shed, they are open buildings with shelving under it to store materials, no people are going to be in there, they don't need parking. We added additional parking to better meet the requirements after receiving comments and added quite a few stalls, well over what we really need so we are trying to be compliant with the regulations, I think the non-compliance now deals with the pole barns but they don't need parking.

In terms of the phase construction, staff wanted more detail on it so we broke out what phase 1 is. It is hard to say when you are looking at something that is a 20-year plus build out to say what the next building is going to look like. We have a good idea what it is going to look like today but is it five or ten years down the road before the next one goes up? We don't really know. This was bought with a long-term vision, it is going to be a while before you see all 20-acres of the pavement out there and it will be a while before you see all the pole barns built and before the maintenance shop is constructed.

In terms of the inconsistencies between phase 1 and the area, the line was intended to talk about the paving limits and that area will not be paved initially to the left of the bold dashed lines. This is a large footprint, however this use doesn't generate much traffic. The facility is constructed out of a need, but one the client would prefer always be empty. The material and equipment in the yard is not working and not earning any income when it is on site, but they need it. They have to have a place to maintain equipment and a place to store it. The staff is going to report directly to the job site, they aren't coming to this site, the equipment will be shipped from here to the job site and it will be there for the duration for the project. Materials that aren't used frequently will be stored here. The employees that will be here daily are a couple of mechanics and four or five people in the shop and a few people coming and going. This is a very limited traffic and wastewater generation; it is a lot of pavement and a lot of buildings but it is not that many people.

We are meeting stormwater requirements; our intent is to not only meet Boone County's but also the City's regulations. They conflict in some ways so in some cases we exceed the county's regulations and exceed the city's in some other cases so stormwater is going to be overdone. The clients want to protect Grindstone Creek downstream and the neighbors. We are preserving trees and we are buffering the creek. The north has a 65-foot wide buffer against the Karen Lane development, all the other sides have a 40-foot screen buffer, that will include an 8-foot tall berm around all four sides of the development and it will include a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees and shrubs. This is here to not only block the visibility of it but to also block the noise; there is going to be beeping out there and we don't want neighbors to have to listen to that. Generally, there will be spurts of activity on the site then it will be quiet, hopefully for weeks.

We recognize that we are coming into an established area, these houses have been there a long time and we want to respect that. This is going to go above and beyond what is required to try to be a good neighbor in the area. We talked about the gravity sewer and I am aware of the maintenance proposed, it is significantly south of this site, it is not on this property. There is no guarantee and we are one recession away from that gravity sewer not being built and for the applicants to say that they will connect to something that doesn't exist and commit ourselves to having to build that sewer is not something we can agree to do, particularly when we have adequate sewer on the property already. We have a drip field out there and adding this site into the county system is like adding another home at most. This a facility that is not used a lot, they aren't washing vehicles every day so that can be pumped back into the county force main.

There was a thought that the development needs to be closer to I-70; those properties are all cut up with streams that need conservation, and we cannot create a facility of this magnitude on those lots and that is why this site was chosen. Impact with a commercial and mixed use and in terms of that being developed you are talking about something that is going to create 200-2000% more traffic than this development will. (The applicant referred to Slide 32 which showed a comparison of traffic generation). We had an open house with the neighbors in November, everyone within 1000-feet got a mailing and I received one email; they thought it was a development across the street on St. Charles. The comments that came up were regarding the screening, noise and traffic; that is why we have the berms on the plan now, we didn't have them initially.

We also received a comment from the developer across the street that didn't like our drive on St. Charles, that is why are going to gate and lock it; we committed to him that we wouldn't use it as a primary entrance and it would only be used in emergencies, we tried to line the road up with his but we didn't have adequate site distance. Trucks need to be able to see a long way in order to turn.

This is a site that is identified for this type of use in the Master Plan. We meet all of the goals in the Master Plan land use except for housing. Our site is identified as a regional economic opportunity area which is a growth area which means it is an area priority for development and is expected to have impacts to the environment and high impervious areas and buildings and pavement. This area is also expected to have utilities available and we have those. Another principle of the Master Plan is transportation. We have provided sidewalks along the front of our property. In the traffic report we not only analyzed turning movements on cars but we took it a step further and did a thorough analysis to see what kind of gaps we are going to have for trucks to turn and what delays that will cause for traffic on Route Z; we are looking at one to two cars being impacted in the peak hour if a truck were to stop and make a left-turn there.

The next principle is in regard to economic development; this facility is relocating from Cooper County. The goal is to retain and attract work force. The next goal is farmland preservation; this site is located outside the Rural Preservation and Farmland Preservation use areas; a conservation area is provided. The next principle is natural resources; the development is intended to protect the natural resources in the area, it is located outside the ecologically significant area. We didn't go further south because the impacts

would have been greater; this is a better site to protect the streams, water quality and the habitat. It is providing buffers to the stream and preserving trees and stormwater management is going to protect the water quality of Hinkson Creek. The next goal regards utilities and infrastructure; much of this goal is about building it where it needs to be but to encourage development where these utilities are already in place. In conclusion, there is no better place in Boone County for this; this is a site that is being encouraged for development in the draft of the new Master Plan, it meets the goals of that plan.

Commissioner Kurzejeski: Looking at the conditions that staff proposed should the Commission approve this, are the applicants in agreement with those conditions? If not, which ones are the applicants opposed to?

Matt Kriete: The applicants have no issues in dealing with the technical requirements. The applicants are fine with taking the washdown water to the sewer system but extending it to a main that does not and may not exist, I don't see how the applicants can commit to that. That would be unwise. If the main existed that is a different story, but it doesn't exist. I have seen all too often, the greatest plans fall apart. The applicants would be happy to connect to the county's force-main.

Commissioner Kurzejeski: I assume the applicants have an issue with Condition 3, the Route Z entrances?

Matt Kriete: For safety reasons we have to have two entrances but we don't want to use two; St. Charles will remain locked and only be secondary access. There is going to be something that will have to pull through there. Equipment being delivered to the site or offsite are coming from I-70 the majority of the time, they aren't coming from St. Charles. When the new collector is in place we could commit to closing the St. Charles entrance and build a new one. I can't commit to putting a second entrance on Route Z that is not safe.

Chairperson Harris: The question was the possibility of two entrances on Route Z; have the applicants precluded that as an option or has MoDOT precluded it?

Matt Kriete: MoDOT will preclude it when they see it. It does not meet engineering principles, their access management guidelines or proper site distances; it is not safe. That is what we wanted to begin with but we couldn't make it work.

Chairperson Harris: There were a number of points in the applicant's presentation similar to a presentation of a colleague of Mr. Kriete's at our meeting last month; many of those points were asking the Commission to trust the applicants. The Commission isn't in the "trust me" business. The applicant made a comment that they think they have fire pressure and flow; is the applicant sure or do they just think?

Matt Kriete: If this property can serve American Outdoor Brands and Battle Highschool and we are looped into that same system; we have pressure and flow that will serve this facility.

Chairperson Harris: A definitive answer is much more appealing than "I think". The applicant made the comment that there would be no traffic congestion on Route Z if a semi with a dozer or scraper is sitting there waiting to make a left turn.

Matt Kriete: That is correct.

Chairperson Harris: How do you figure that?

Matt Kriete: That is using acceptable engineering practices and guidelines on how you analyze the delays and gaps in turning movements. We look at the gaps in between the cars and if it is adequate time for a

semi to make a left turn and clear the gap. The calculations indicate that while the semi is waiting to make a turn, it says they are impacting about 1 ½ cars that might have to slow down and stop behind them which is well within an acceptable standard that MoDOT will see as acceptable. All of those calculations have been provided to MoDOT and the county.

Chairperson Harris: Has the connection to the county sewer district been confirmed?

Matt Kriete: That has been agreed to in the last Board meeting. It is on record in their last meeting as well, that they have given consent.

Chairperson Harris: Do they have the capacity?

Matt Kriete: They have capacity; we have to work out how to engineer it. The sewer district doesn't want us to use their pump so we have to tie-in downstream on their force-main. We have to look at the hydraulic analysis of our pump going into their force-main. We might need to down-grade our pump a little bit due to velocity and find something with a little less pressure. I am confident we can make it work.

Chairperson Harris: With regard to a proposed connection to the City of Columbia system, is staff saying that the applicants have to connect to that now even though it doesn't exist? Or, is staff looking for a commitment that when it is available it gets connected?

Bill Florea: That it is connected to when it is available.

Chairperson Harris asked if the applicant's will commit to connecting when it is available.

Matt Kriete stated he misunderstood the condition.

Thad Yonke stated that the Subdivision Regulations required connection to the sewer and that hasn't been worked out. Mr. Yonke stated that, and the many other issues is why staff recommended the request be tabled until these issues were worked out or denied.

Chairperson Harris stated that there seemed to be a lack of willingness by the applicants to listen to, or work with staff to iron out these issues and that these are things that should have been worked out prior to this meeting. Chairperson Harris asked about the buffer and screening.

Matt Kriete stated that there are currently rows of mature trees, the applicant intends to leave those.

Chairperson Harris asked about the 8-foot berm and if that will be built by bringing material from an outside source to the site or if it will be scraped from the site.

Matt Kriete stated it will be scraped from the site.

Chairperson Harris asked about the phasing of the development and if the applicants had any idea of how that will be done.

Matt Kriete stated there is a dashed line which shows about half of the site to be developed.

Chairperson Harris asked if there would be about 15-acres and all of the stormwater developed in the first phase.

Matt Kriete stated yes, the applicants intent is to grow into the property.

Chairperson Harris asked Commissioner McCann how wide St. Charles Road is.

Commissioner McCann stated he was unsure but likely 22-24-feet wide.

Chairperson Harris asked if it was chip-sealed.

Commissioner McCann stated it was asphalt.

Chairperson Harris asked the width of Route Z.

Commissioner McCann guessed it was about 24-26-feet wide.

Chairperson Harris asked if the proposed driveway was 60-feet wide.

Matt Kriete stated it was 40-feet.

Commissioner Kurzejeski asked about the St. Charles Road access and if the intent was intended for use only by emergency services .

Matt Kriete stated that is primarily what it is for but there will be exceptions. Trucks will be able to turn around on the site.

Chairperson Harris stated there were deficiencies in the plan and some are technical in nature.

Matt Kriete stated his questions to staff about phase 1 have never been answered.

Chairperson Harris asked how staff was supposed to answer the questions if they can't determine what phase 1 entails. In addition, the applicants haven't answered questions about the traffic fee.

Matt Kriete stated that was defined in the traffic study; it seems to be an extreme fee but it can be worked out during the Final Development Plan phase.

Chairperson Harris asked how many phases will this development be built in.

Matt Kriete stated probably four or five; but there will only be 10 employees at complete build out.

Chairperson Harris asked about the southern setback shown on the plan.

Thad Yonke stated that was a mistake and should have been listed at 25-feet; that will have to be fixed.

Commissioner Kurzejeski asked about the hours of operation.

Matt Kriete stated he didn't know what is considered "daylight hours".

Bill Florea stated it is defined in the zoning regulations. Mr. Florea read the definition of daylight hours.

Matt Kriete stated those hours may work but they may need to consider "contractor holidays" rather than State holidays.

Commissioner Trecha mentioned the transportation fee and if the applicants were prepared to do full build out calculation.

Matt Kriete stated the difference between phase 1 and the full build out is \$100,000.

Commissioner Trecha asked if the applicants could provide both numbers.

Matt Kriete stated yes.

Chairperson Harris asked staff if those numbers have been provided.

Thad Yonke stated the applicants based the number on the number of staff rather than the size of the buildings, which is what is required. Nothing in the plan limits the number of employees; staff asked for the max number for what can be on the site based on the use of the property. That needs to be worked out before this can move forward.

Matt Kriete stated the full build-out was 43,000.

Matt Kriete referred to the traffic slides in the presentation and stated the assumption is 126 trips per day with 10 employees.

Chairperson Harris asked if staff had been provided with that information.

Matt Kriete stated it would have been provided if they asked for it.

Thad Yonke stated that staff asked for additional traffic information three weeks ago and it was only provided yesterday.

Bill Florea stated that staff didn't have adequate time to analyze it.

Commissioner Kurzejeski stated that he doesn't see how this can be approved with so many outstanding issues.

Matt Kriete stated he understands that staff hasn't had time to review the information provided and that it was a misunderstanding because the applicants believed they answered all the questions.

Chairperson Harris stated there seems to be a lack of cooperation with staff, the submission dates have been on the calendar for decades and people are expected to meet those deadlines; blowing staff off doesn't get you anywhere.

Open to public hearing.

Present speaking in favor of the request:

Janell Drane, Willow Creek Division (no street address provided)

Janell Drane stated her concern was with the St. Charles Road entrance; the applicant addressed that concern.

Present speaking in opposition to the request:

Jennifer Caine, 2215 N Traveller Dr, Columbia

Jennifer Caine stated her concerns were with removal of trees, traffic impacts, not just from automobiles but from trucks backing up the traffic, the amount of concrete and the lack of enhancements to the

surrounding community. Ms. Caine quoted Mr. Kriete stating “even the best plans fall apart”. Ms. Caine stated that this development will change the character of the neighborhood.

Closed to public hearing.

Matt Kriete stated he wished he had an opportunity to speak with Ms. Caine before this meeting; while this does look like a massive operation, it isn't. The contractors will be working elsewhere.

Commissioner Trecha asked if there could be a provision to close the St. Charles Road entrance once the new collector is built.

Thad Yonke stated maybe; staff still doesn't have a full understanding of the development. It seems the applicants based the number on the amount of employees and not the allowed uses on the plan. This property could be sold to an Emery Sapp & Sons-type of contractor as soon as the rezoning is approved and there are no mechanisms to limit a larger scale. There is no note on the plan that guarantees the St. Charles Road access to be gated so staff looked at it as a full access. Staff just doesn't know and that is part of the problem.

Commissioner Trecha asked if the trucks going in and out of the site are owned by the company or if they are owned by outside vendors.

Matt Kriete stated he believed it would likely be a mix of both.

Commissioner Trecha asked if the trucks could be required to have white-noise back up noise instead of beeping.

Matt Kriete stated the applicants could not control what type of noises are on vendor-owned vehicles. That is why berms are proposed.

Commissioner Harvey stated there may be OSHA requirements involved with the back-up noise. Commissioner Harvey stated that the applicant indicated that the equipment is typically on the job site.

Chairperson Harris asked if the berm was 8-feet above current grade or above the newly paved grade.

Matt Kriete stated that while the type of business is similar to Emery Sapp & Sons, this is on a different scale and not a huge traffic generator.

Commissioner Proctor asked when the submission date was.

Uriah Mach stated November 25, 2024.

Commissioner Proctor asked why the applicants were reluctant to work with staff.

Matt Kriete stated he was only made aware of some of the issues this evening.

Commissioner Proctor asked if the applicant called or emailed staff.

Matt Kriete stated he spoke with staff a couple of days ago.

Commissioner Proctor stated that the Commission saw these same issues with this same engineering firm last month and suggested that in the future, the applicants work more closely with staff so that the Commission doesn't have to discuss this for hours.

Matt Kriete stated he spoke with his clients and they didn't know how the phases they were going to go; it depends on the economy.

Commissioner Proctor stated that the Commission has seen like developments before without these many issues because the applicants work with staff beforehand.

Commissioner Harris asked if questions were answered in a timely manner.

Matt Kriete stated comments were received on Thanksgiving and the applicants responded to those comments.

Thad Yonke stated that the response to the question about the traffic study was that it had already been submitted; the additional traffic study wasn't submitted until yesterday. In addition, staff expected more in the way of a phasing plan. Staff tried to work with the applicants to address issues ahead of time, but the communication was not forthcoming.

Chairperson Harris stated that the applicants wouldn't start on a project of this size without a clear path; the applicants can't ask the Commission to approve something without a clear path. These questions could have been worked out with better communication and cooperation from the applicants.

Commissioner Trecha made, and Commissioner Harvey seconded a motion to table, until the February 20, 2025 meeting, the requests by Ana Lee Grone Revocable Living Trust to rezone from Agriculture 1 (A-1) to Planned Light Industrial (M-LP) and to approve a review plan and preliminary plat for Grone Subdivision on 36.12 acres located at 2115 Rte Z, Columbia:

<i>Boyd Harris – Yes</i>	<i>Eric Kurzejeski – Yes</i>
<i>Greg Martin – Yes</i>	<i>Randal Trecha – Yes</i>
<i>Rhonda Proctor – Yes</i>	<i>Kevin Harvey – Yes</i>
<i>Robert Schreiber – Yes</i>	<i>Christy Schnarre – Yes</i>
<i>Jeffrey Ehimuh – Yes</i>	<i>Jeff McCann – Yes</i>

Motion to table the rezoning, review plan and preliminary plat passes unanimously

This request is tabled until the February 20, 2025 meeting at 7:00 PM.

End of December 19, 2024 minutes for this item.

Senior Planner, Thad Yonke stated that the applicants have worked with staff and gave the following supplemental staff report:

Technical issues:

- The project is now proposed to be entirely publicly sewerred, no form of on-site wastewater is proposed or allowed.
- A phasing plan with enough detail has been proposed to be enforceable. Previously the phasing plan was too vague and internally inconsistent.
- The St. Charles Road entrance is proposed as emergency access only.

- Staff looked for a holiday calendar for the Missouri Association of General Contractors but could not find one. The calendar on their website lists meetings/functions but not Holidays (Not even major ones were listed such as Memorial Day, Fourth of July) This was the applicant's suggestion as to operational hours.
- A revised traffic letter showing all the site traffic using the Route Z entrance has been provided. Even with all the traffic using this entrance, the proposal still does not indicate improvements at this location.
- Parking has been corrected, the standard count would be 167 spaces, in a planned development there is some flexibility, they have proposed 42 spaces at build-out, 30 of which will be provided with phase 1.
- An analysis of the impact fee has been provided which indicates that \$90,092 be provided with the first building permit and \$36,767 be provided for the remainder assuming the remainder to be built very soon after the initial phase. The documentation as to how the numbers were derived is mostly consistent with the Northeast Area Traffic Plan methodology.

The applicant and staff have worked out almost all the technical issues. What remains is the question of suitability of the proposed use at this location, and whether the use matches the adopted plans of the County. From the previous staff report: The Northeast Area Plan shows this area as suitable for "Mixed Small Industrial & Commercial Transition". The text component of the plan that provides the nuanced and detailed explanation of what is expected in terms of the type and characteristics of development states "Commercial uses envisioned within corridor should follow the "Neighborhood Commons concept as described in the Metro 2020 Plan in order to support the residential neighborhoods of the plan area."

Additionally, the first Goal of this section is "Develop integrated, appropriate commercial centers that contribute to the quality of life within the plan area. This proposal does not contribute to the quality of life within the plan area. The proposed use does not produce anything an area user would consume/directly or utilize to improve their quality of life.

The majority of the adjoining land uses along this property are either proposed residential or existing residential.

The only adjoining industrial land is approximately 200 feet and is that of the subsurface public wastewater system serving the industrial park further to the southeast.

Staff still believe that this use is too intensive to be consistent with the uses designated for the area by the Northeast Area Plan and still recommends denial.

The following are the proposed conditions of the original staff report and whether they still apply.

- The applicant shall prepare a new original mylar with corrections acceptable to the Director of Resource Management to address errors and deficiencies not corrected prior to the original resubmission deadline.

The applicants have made specific changes to the proposed pages to address most issues and will be getting us a new Mylar if the current one isn't correct.

- That the washdown wastewater and any further sewer needs are required to be treated by the City of Columbia sewer main being extended to the area and that should any on-site system be

proposed/approved it would be considered temporary as there is a planned central system, such temporary use only until the new central system is available.

The applicant has revised the proposal to remove all text and graphics about on-site wastewater from the document and now the proposal only uses central public sewer so this condition is no longer needed.

- The proposed entrance to St. Charles Road be removed and the possibility of two entrances onto Route Z be explored. Additionally, the buffering along St. Charles be improved to mitigate noise impacts to the satisfaction of the Director of Resource Management.

The condition is no longer needed now, emergency only entrance part of proposal.

- Prior to submission of a Final Plan the developer proposes what they believe the transportation fee should be, based upon the methodology set out in the Northeast Area Transportation Study and then work with Staff to set the appropriate amount. A payment schedule will be a required component of compliance with this condition.

The applicant has proposed an impact fee in keeping with the Northeast Area Transportation Plan methodology and a recommended replacement is found in the next section of the report.

- Hours of operation should be limited to Daytime Hours of Operation with no operations occurring on State Recognized Holidays.

Should the Commission believe the proposed use is appropriate for the site, staff recommends the following additional conditions:

- Hours of operation should be limited to Daytime Hours of Operation as defined in the Zoning ordinance with no operations occurring on State Recognized Holidays.
- The impact fee of \$90,092 shall be paid at the time of the building permit application, assuming the building permit application comes in within a year of the approval date of the Final Plan. Should the building permit be applied for after the year it should be adjusted by the CPI accordingly to the satisfaction of the Director of Resource Management. The remainder of the impact fee should be paid when the second building permit is applied for and should be adjusted from the proposed base of \$36,767 by the CPI to the satisfaction of the Director of Resource Management.

Present, representing the request:

Matt Kriete, Engineering Surveys & Services, 1113 Fay St, Columbia

Matt Kriete: Over the last several weeks we spent a lot of time working with staff and I believe we are all on the same page now. The applicants are fine with the conditions. In our opinion, this development is consistent with the Boone County Master Plan and meets the goals of the Northeast Area Plan. To meet all the goals of any plan on any development is not going to occur; the goal is to try to check as many of the boxes as we can and we have met many of those. We are located in a growth area and we have access to Interstate 70 by an arterial road; we've done green-space conservation as defined in the plan, utilities are available and road infrastructure is available. This is a future growth sector identified in the Master Plan. I would argue providing employment opportunity is quality of life; while it may not be on a shelf in your kitchen, this is producing quality of life. Our quality of life has been influenced by contractors like this; without site-work contractors things don't get built so I think our quality of life is improved by this and

everyone of those homes in the area were influenced by a site-work contractor; they graded the lots, built the roads and put in the infrastructure. While we don't see it or think about it, that is the quality of life we have. I think this is a development that improves that area and meets those requirements. There could be developments in this area that could produce 2000 times more traffic and activity on this site than this development does. There could be development that has more noise and visual impacts; those have been mitigated. With the work that we have done with providing the screening and buffering of the berms and trees I believe this will ultimately be a low-intensity development.

Chairperson Harris: Is the pipeline easement shown an active line?

Matt Kriete: Yes, I think it is Magellan.

Chairperson Harris: Are you putting concrete over it?

Matt Kriete: Yes, we are probably putting pavement over a good chunk of it. We have had preliminary discussions with the provider.

Chairperson Harris: The emergency access onto St. Charles Road is going to be somewhat limiting on traffic and will only be a 40-foot paved area with the radius outside of the 40-foot paved area?

Matt Kriete: Yes; it is a 40-foot driveway and the radius is tying into the existing pavement. It will have a locked gate.

Chairperson Harris: Does being locked impede anything as far as emergency services?

Commissioner Martin: As long as there is a way to unlock it. Generally, we will drive around to the second entrance.

Matt Kriete: We can work out getting a knox box there.

Chairperson Harris: If it is 40-feet emergency services won't have a problem getting in there?

Commissioner Martin: No.

Chairperson Harris: I question why just one entrance on Route Z; it makes more sense to have two entrances there.

Matt Kriete: If we could have two we would; it is a safety issue. The vertical curves on Route Z prohibit adequate sight distance if the driveway were moved north or south. Putting two driveways in there and adding the required separation would make one of the entrances unsafe. We know we will have low boys and semi-trucks coming in and out, so good sight distance is critical to make this safe.

Chairperson Harris: Is it going to be a 60-foot entrance?

Matt Kriete: I believe I have that at 40-feet.

Chairperson Harris: If you start bringing in a triple axle low boy in there 40-feet may not be wide enough.

Matt Kriete: After reviewing the plan it is wider; it is probably 60-feet.

Chairperson Harris: Where does the impact fee go and what is it used for?

Bill Florea: It is really a traffic mitigation fee, not really an impact fee; it goes into a fund to cover future road construction. It is a result of the Northeast Area Traffic Study which established a conceptual road network in the Northeast Area Plan area. This is contributions as land is developed, developers contribute into a fund that the county will hold until there are sufficient funds to make improvements that were identified in that plan.

Thad Yonke: Traveller Drive is on the western edge of the property, if the applicants could have aligned Traveller fully on themselves, they would have had the option, rather than agree to contribute the fee, they could have proposed to build that because that is one of the roads identified on the plan. So, the money either eventually goes toward those roads or the roads themselves.

Chairperson Harris: What do the applicants project is going to be in the yard and in the office?

Matt Kriete: It will be pretty limited traffic and use. There will be up to five people in the office on a full-time basis, there will be some mechanics that will be in the shop; that is the full-time staff on site. The yard itself is either extra materials, equipment not being used and extra storage of materials for the next job. There won't be a lot of activity in the yard on a day to day basis. When the next job comes they will be loading up and moving equipment out; all of the equipment and materials will be moved to the job site and remain there until the job is done. Ideally, the contractor wants to move equipment from one job directly to the next without having to take it back to the yard.

Commissioner Ehimuh: Does the mechanical work include auto-body type work?

Matt Kriete: It will be more mechanical such as engine repair, welding, hydraulic systems, and general maintenance of the equipment. The wash bay is there to clean the equipment. It is not an ongoing operation, maintenance is being done as needed.

Commissioner Ehimuh: The applicants will ensure the waste disposal of any fluids aren't leeching into the area?

Matt Kriete: That is where the maintenance shop comes in handy because there are materials stored in there in enclosed containers. They will get it off the site. There shouldn't be any spills but accidents happen; we have some BMPs on site to mitigate that. There is a big paved area but it is being mitigated by that treatment.

Commissioner Ehimuh: When you are washing all the trucks and the runoff from it; the applicants will make sure that any runoff is mitigated.

Matt Kriete: The wash bay is an enclosed building; there will be an oil/water separator that will collect the sediment and oil; that will be professionally removed and cleaned up. It won't run off the site or get into any of the BMPs.

Chairperson Harris: The applicants are basically paving the whole property; is this being done in anticipation of more vehicular traffic than equipment traffic? You don't want a dozer on a concrete slab very much.

Matt Kriete: That is going to happen occasionally; there will be areas where the equipment is stored.

Chairperson Harris: The probability of there being a high-volume of heavy equipment in there is limited.

Matt Kriete: It is limited, they are coming in for maintenance; they don't want the equipment to remain on site, they want them on the job site working. There will be areas that are chip and seal but there will be

limited traffic on it just to go in and out to get the material. The material may sit there for months before they come in to grab it.

Chairperson Harris: Having looked at the property again today and with consideration to the Northeast Plan and some of the things proposed in the new Master Plan and how we site some commercial properties. I fear the reality of that area being purely residential with Camping World and AOB, the reality to me with that corridor staying residential, that ship may have already sailed. Also the fact that there was no opposition at the public hearing.

Bill Florea: There was one opposed.

Chairperson Harris: But there wasn't a great outcry. That is telling us that the community may have resolved to that same conclusion.

Chairperson Harris made, and Commissioner Harvey seconded a motion to approve the request by Ana Lee Grone Revocable Living Trust to rezone from Agriculture 1 (A-1) to Planned Light Industrial (M-LP) on 36.12 acres located at 2115 Rte Z, Columbia:

Boyd Harris – Yes	Greg Martin – Yes
Steve Koirtyohann – NO	Randal Trecha – Yes
Kevin Harvey – Yes	Christy Schnarre – Yes
Jeffrey Ehimuh – Yes	Jeff McCann – NO

Motion to approve the rezoning request passes 6 YES 2 NO

Commissioner Harvey made, and Chairperson Harris seconded a motion to approve the request by Ana Lee Grone Revocable Living Trust to approve a review plan and preliminary plat for Grone Subdivision on 36.12 acres located at 2115 Rte Z, Columbia with the following conditions:

- Hours of operation should be limited to Daytime Hours of Operation as defined in the Zoning ordinance with no operations occurring on State Recognized Holidays.
- The Trip Generation Fee of \$90,092 shall be paid at the time of the building permit application, assuming the building permit application comes in within a year of the approval date of the Final Plan. Should the building permit be applied for after the year it should be adjusted by the CPI accordingly to the satisfaction of the Director of Resource Management. The remainder of the traffic mitigation fee should be paid when the second building permit is applied for and should be adjusted from the proposed base of \$36,767 by the CPI to the satisfaction of the Director of Resource Management.

Boyd Harris – Yes	Greg Martin – Yes
Steve Koirtyohann – Yes	Randal Trecha – Yes
Kevin Harvey – Yes	Christy Schnarre – Yes
Jeffrey Ehimuh – Yes	Jeff McCann – Yes

Motion to approve the review plan and preliminary plat passes unanimously

Chairperson Harris informed the applicant that these requests would go before the County Commission for public hearing on Tuesday, March 11, 2025 at 7:00 PM and the applicants or their representative need to be present.

2. Update on Commission Action

Director, Bill Florea updated the Commission on the actions of the County Commission:

The rezoning request by Dale & Karen Wesselmann was approved.

The rezoning request by Terry & Erma Pauley was tabled by the County Commission.

The Zoning Regulations were re-adopted with the updated Stormwater Regulation modifications.

3. Boone County Master Plan Summary Update

Stephen Ibendhal with the i5 Group was present to give a summary update of the proposed Boone County Master Plan. A copy of the summary is attached to the end of these minutes.

Stephen Ibehdahl stated the i5 Group has worked closely with the Advisory and Technical Committees. We released a draft plan in November and had all of December to review and receive comment. 27 written comments were received during the review process and incorporated those comments into the draft plan. Of those 27 comments, most were positive. We were able to track the amount of visitors to the website and there were over 800 unique visitors to the website during the review period. Over the past two years we've had close to over 7000 visitors to the website. The plan is now being turned over to the Planning and Zoning Commission and as they receive comments, they should direct any other changes to the plan before voting to adopt. It has been over 25 years since the last plan; hopefully the new plan will provide a framework so the county can more easily update. One of the key recommendations was to review it every five years and potentially more frequently if needed.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

1. Public hearings for the Boone County Master Plan

Public hearings for the proposed Boone County Master Plan have been scheduled for the following:

- Tuesday, February 25 at 6:30 PM at Centralia City Council Chambers.
- Tuesday, March 4 at 6:30 PM at the Southern Boone Schools Central Board Room
- Thursday, March 20 at 7:00 PM at the regular P & Z Commission meeting.

IX. ADJOURN

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary
Greg Martin, Secretary

Minutes approved on this 20th day of March, 2025