

AGENDA

CITY OF CENTRALIA, MISSOURI
Planning and Zoning Commission
Thursday, June 11, 2015
6:00 P.M.
City Hall Council Chambers

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings
- IV. Proposed change to M-1 Zoning height restrictions
- V. Discussion of Comprehensive Plan Update
- VI. As May Arise
- VII. Adjourn

Minutes of the City of Centralia, Missouri Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting of Thursday April 9, 2015.

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL – Commissioners Present: LeeAllen Smith (Chair), Don Bagley (Vice Chair), Dale Hughes, Tim Grenke (Mayor), Don Bormann, Jim Lee, Mark Mustain Absent: Harvey Million, Guy Lee. Also present City Attorney, Merritt Beck and City Administrator, Matt Harline, Darren Adams.

II. Pledge of Allegiance
Those present said the pledge

III. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings
Don Bormann noted that on page **A motion was made by Don Bagley to approve the minutes from the Planning and Zoning Commission of November 13, 2014. The motion was seconded by Bormann and approved unanimously by voice vote.**

IV. Request to Vacate a Portion of Southland Street

A. Consideration of Request for Vacation

Harline explained that there was a request from Darren Adams, son of Barbara Adams, who is the owner of record of Dan-Mar-Dale Subdivision, to vacate approximately the eastern 900 feet of the right-of-way street easement of Southland Drive. Harline noted that Mr. Adams planned to extend Lockport Drive North from the Cobblestone Lake Estates Subdivision into the southeast part of Dan-Mar-Dale and terminate the street in cul-de-sac. Harline noted that the current configuration of Southland as platted would likely never be built. Harline explained that a low –water crossing was estimated at \$80,000 may years ago but that a full bridge structure would be in the neighborhood of \$300,000. If the City wanted the development to occur as platted it is likely that City funds would need to be expended in constructing the bridge. Adams explained that he planned to do a lot split and combination to yield two large lots for two houses.

Harline noted that the eastern end of Southland was zoned R-3 to allow for enough density to make the bridge affordable.

Harline stated that the only real point of contention is whether or not the City should insist that some stub street should be taken east from Lockport Drive either from what is now part of Dan-Mar-Dale or from Cobblestone Lake Estates to the property to the east to connect the developments.

Harline noted that Beck attempted to describe the precise location of the vacation request. Adams stated that he was asking for a vacation of the right of way east of Lot 7 of Block 2 of Dan-Mar-Dale. Adams said that he would remain owning Block 1 Block 2 lot 10 and

11 would be donated to Cobblestone Lake Estates. Harline asked if he planned to edit Cobblestone Lake Estate Plat 3 to note the additional common land and Adams replied he wasn't sure yet. Mustain asked if he was just asking to vacate Southland and not Orchard. Adams replied that was correct. Adams did want to vacate the 120 foot piece of Southland that headed North. Harline asked about access to the sewer line by easement on the Cox property. Adams replied that an easement existed connecting to the City Water plant. Mustain noted that there is a ten foot utility easement at the southern edge of Block 1 that will match up with a ten foot easement at the northern end of Cobblestone. Mustain asked where the residential development would be going and where Lockport Drive would come in, possibly lot 3. Adams replied it would come in lots 2 and 3. Adams described how Lockport drive would come into Dan-Mar-Dale at a diagonal from the NE corner of Lot 28 into lots 3 of block 1 and lots 9 and 10 of block 2 of Dan-Mar-Dale. Adams said he would divide the lots into one on the west if about 3.9 acres, and 4.125 acres to the east.

Harline asked about the utility easements in Dan-Mar-Dale. He asked about the northern side of Block 3 lots. Adams said that all of the easements in Block 3 could be vacated because the City does not like rear lot electric easements anymore. Mustain noted that easements in the front would be needed. Harline and Mustain asked questions to ascertain that no need easements would be vacated. Harline asked if a drawing

Harline asked if the Commission needed additional information.

Harline asked if Adams would be willing to take Lockport Drive north and then east to terminate for future development to the Cox property. Adams said he did not feel it would serve any purpose. Harline explained how he thought it would improve the connectivity of the properties if the Cox property develops.

Various options for stubbing a street to the east to provide for a future connection to the Cox property. Adams said he didn't feel it was option in his eyes because it ruined the aesthetic of the subdivision. Adams would rather just build the platted lots than lose the privacy. Adams would rescind his request to vacate Southland and ask to build on the platted lots rather than stub a street to the east. .

Mustain asked if a motion had been made. Harline said none had been made

B. Recommendation to the Board of Aldermen

Harline described the language that might be included in a motion as he understood the desires of the Commission.

A motion was made by Mustain to recommend that the Board of Aldermen approve the vacation of Southland Drive from the east side of lot 7 in block 2 of Dan-Mar-Dale Subdivision extending east to the East terminus (approximately 750 feet) plus the 50 foot right of way elbow to the north. The motion was seconded by Hughes. Chairman Lee asked for more discussion.

Adams said that he thought development, if he was going to occur on the Cox property it would start in the north toward Lake Dutcher where most of the infrastructure is close off of Lakeview. Mustain clarified that his motion was to focus the debate, but he felt that access to the east that the minimal gain for a stub to the east did not warrant the request. Bormann said that good planning would require connection to the east, but it is not the end of the world and no real harm would come from not requiring. He has seen cities have to buy lots to provide access when there is not good planning. In this case he was a toss-up. Adams said that he had done everything he could to reduce cut-through traffic and that is why he is against it as much as he is. Adams said he wants to move to the cul-de-sac to allow his kids to play in the safe streets. Hughes said that he felt that sufficient connection could be provided by the extension of Lakeview to the east. Harline said that we were speculating on speculation both that any development of the Cox property would occur and then where it would occur. Bormann noted that crossing the creek would be expensive and likely require City help. J. Lee noted that development could not go to the north (across the tracks).

J. Lee asked if Adams would consider taking Hampton Drive straight through lot 32 and connect to the east. Harline said that would go against Adams's plan to avoid a straight shot through. Adams said that he and his partner would object to that. Bormann said that the Commission and Council had an opportunity at the Preliminary Plat stage to ask for connection to the east and they didn't so it may be too late. Bormann said good planning suggests you should do it, but he can see how economics may say you shouldn't. Harline asked if it is as objectionable to take Hampton through. Adams said he and his partner Dave would not be for it, because it would not advantage Dave at all. Bormann said the plat conforms to the approved Preliminary Plat. Harline said that the value of the lot would be in the neighborhood of \$30,000 retail at least half that in investment, and it would be hard for the City to ask for that. But this should be something to consider in the future. Bormann agreed that connection is desirable.

Chairman Lee noted that there was a motion and a second on the floor and asked for any additional discussion. Harline repeated the motion. Harline asked if Beck was okay with it.

Lee asked for the vote and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

V. Considering Final Plat of Cobblestone Lake Estates Subdivision

Harline gave a quick update of progress in Cobblestone Lake Estates. Adams added that they had poured the curbs and were waiting on the weather. Adams added they were waiting to pour the belly of the street which they plan to do in one day. Harline asked Adams about the Homeowners' Association and Adams replied that he had spoken to his attorney that day and it was in process. Harline noted it was important to have that association in place to take care of the lake. Harline noted the other edits required by the Commission

Bormann asked about the easements along Southland because it makes sense to get rid of the ones we don't need. Harline noted that the motion did not include any utility

easement vacation. Harline noted that he didn't have a problem with vacating easements in Block 3 as long as we get an easement along the front of Ivy. Bormann said he felt we could vacate the easements in that area where we didn't need them. Mustain, Bormann and Adams reviewed the current location of utilities. Bormann said we could vacate the easements of the southern portions of lots 1 -3. Harline asked if Bormann was asking to vacate easements in lots 8 – 10. Bormann said he meant 8 -11. Harline noted that there was a sewer easement on lot 11 that we need. Bormann said he only meant the utility easements on the south side of the lots. After discussion it was determined that the 10 foot utility easements on the south side of lots 8 -11 in Block 2, across the south side of lots 3 -6 of Block 1 and the north side (rear of the lot) of lots 1 -5 of Block 3.

Mustain noted that the City would need easements on the new cul-de-sac.

Bormann made a motion to vacate those utility easements that had been discussed that include the southern ten feet of Lots Two (2) through Six (6) of Block One (1); the southern ten feet of Lots Eight (8) through Eleven (11) of Block Two (2) and the northern ten feet of lots One (1) through Five (5) of Block Three (3) of the Dan-Mar-Dale Subdivision. The motion was seconded by Mustain and approved by unanimous voice vote

Harline noted the motion made by the Commission on November 13th to recommend approval of the subdivision with six stipulations. Adams said he hoped he could get it finalized by April 20th. Adams noted that only the belly of the street remained to be poured. Harline noted that he and Phil planned to inspect the pouring of the street as much for the City's edification as anything.

VI. Comprehensive Plan Update

Harline noted that he had asked Lynn Behrns about assisting with City's Comprehensive Plan. Harline that Mr. Behrns was willing to do the write up, but did not want to attend a great deal of meetings. Harline noted that the comprehensive plan was the basis for zoning; that it provided a protection of property rights because even though you could be prevented from certain uses you gained a protection by knowing what could be expected.

Harline outlined his plan to appoint four committees: Land Use and Multi-modal Transportation; Utilities; Public Works and the Environment; Community Facilities; Financial Resources. Harline said that we could use the data Behrns had collected but that his idea was to include more public participation. Grenke asked about including the EEZ Board and Chamber and CREDI. Harline replied he could see them contributing to the Financial Resources Committee and possibly getting help from the Mid-Missouri Regional Planning Commission. Beck suggested working with the Fireside Guard and Harline agreed that would be

As May Arise

Chairman Lee asked if 6:00 pm would be an acceptable time for a meeting. Everyone seemed to agree that 6:00 pm would work for a meeting time

Harline noted that there was no request from the School Board

Bagley made a motion to adjourn that was seconded by Grenke and approved unanimously by voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Y:\Meetings\03 - Board of Aldermen\2015 - 2016\20-April 2015\Minutes - P&Z - April 9 2015.docx

From: Matt Harline, City Administrator
To: Planning & Zoning Commission
CC: Merritt Beck, City Attorney
Date: June 9, 2015
Re: General meeting notes



The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Item IV. Proposed change to M-1 Zoning height restrictions

MFA has submitted a building permit application to the City for a new grain elevator that would be 142 feet tall and will be submitting applications for two additional structures. Strictly interpreting the law I probably should have rejected MFA's permit based on the height even though it is a permitted use in the M-1 district. However, a quick survey of several other nearby cities suggested that our ordinance may be considered overly strict. Therefore, I have allowed MFA to proceed, with the hope that this Commission and the Board of Alderman will see their way to allow for specific exceptions to the height restrictions in M-1.

Section 31-30 Subsection A. of the Centralia City Code reads:

In District "M-1", the height of buildings and minimum dimensions of lots and yards shall be as follows:

"A. Height. Buildings or structures shall not exceed one hundred (100) feet or eight (8) stories in height."

Section 31-45 reads Subsection C reads:

"C. Parapet walls shall not extend more than six (6) feet above the height limit. Flagpoles, chimneys, cooling towers, electric display signs, elevator bulkheads, penthouses, finials, gas tanks, grain elevators, stacks, storage towers, radio towers, ornamental towers, monuments, cupolas, domes, spires, standpipes and necessary mechanical appurtenances may be erected as to height in accordance with existing or hereafter adopted laws or ordinances of the City."

M-1 is the least restrictive district and this is the only place such a structure could be built. The existing MFA grain elevator is over 100 feet tall as well. Based on discussion with MFA, I believe was built before the zoning code was adopted in 1961. However, as a legal non-conforming use, it might not be possible to build the structure back if it was damaged somehow.

A collection of excerpts from other cities' codes regarding the M-1 zoning district (or the equivalent) are included below. Columbia places no restriction on the height of structures in M-1.

Mexico:

Sec. 15-392. - Buildings and structures to which height limitations not applicable.

The height limitations of this chapter shall not apply to:

- | | | |
|--------------------|--|---------------------------|
| (1) Church spires; | (7) Stage towers or
scenery lofts; | (11) Chimneys; |
| (2) Belfries; | (8) Cooling towers; | (12) Elevator bulkheads; |
| (3) Monuments; | (9) Ornamental towers and
spires; | (13) Smoke stacks; |
| (4) Water towers; | (10) Radio and television
towers, antennas or
aerials; | (14) Grain elevators; and |
| (5) Tanks; | | (15) Flag poles. |
| (6) Fire towers; | | |

Moberly:

Sec. 27. - Height regulations.

Chimneys, cooling towers, elevator head houses, fire towers, grain elevators, monuments, stacks, stage towers, or scenery lofts, tanks, water towers, ornamental towers, spires, church steeples, and necessary mechanical appurtenances, usually required to be placed above the roof level and not intended for human occupancy, are not subject to the height limitations contained in the district regulations. In all planned districts, one (1) additional foot of height above the specified height limitation shall be permitted for each foot of additional yard provided over the minimum requirement on all sides of the lot.

Fulton

Sec. 5. - Height regulations.

(A) Maximum height. Maximum height limits established for buildings and structures not otherwise specified are as follows:

- (1) Thirty-five (35) feet in Residential Districts.
- (2) Forty-five (45) feet in Commercial and Industrial Districts.

(B) Exceptions. The above height limits may be exceeded in the following instances:

(1) Public, semi-public or public service buildings, hospitals, institutions, agricultural buildings, or schools, when permitted in a district, may be erected to a height not exceeding one hundred ten (110) feet, and churches and temples may be erected to a height not exceeding seventy-five (75) feet, if the building is set back from each yard line at least one (1) foot for each foot of additional building height above the height limit otherwise permitted in the district in which the building is built.

(2) Television and radio towers, church spires, belfries, monuments, tanks, water and fire towers, stage towers or scenery lofts, cooling towers, ornamental towers and spires, chimneys, elevator bulkheads, stacked, conveyors and flag poles may be erected to such height as may be authorized by the council.

Harrisonville:

A. In District "M-2", the height of buildings, the minimum dimension of lot and yards shall be as follows:

1. Height. Buildings or structures shall not exceed one hundred fifty (150) feet in height.
2. Front yard. There shall be a front yard of not less than twenty-five (25) feet.

3. Side yards. A side yard shall be provided on each side of a building or unit group of buildings of not less than ten (10) feet.
4. Rear yard. There shall be a rear yard of not less than twenty (20) feet

Sedalia:

(d) Density. In district A, there shall be a maximum area density of five percent of the land area being covered by buildings or structures.

- (1) Area. All lots or parcels shall contain a minimum area of five acres.
- (2) Height. No height restriction (except as prescribed by Federal Aviation Agency of the United States).
- (3) Front yards. Any building hereinafter constructed shall provide for a front yard having a minimum depth of at least 80 feet from the centerline of the traveled road. Corner lots shall provide such setback for both roads.
- (4) Side and rear yards. Side and rear yards shall be a minimum of 50 feet.

Proposed language:

Option A: Amend Article XII: Height, Yard and Area Exceptions and Additional Regulations; Section 31-45:

Parapet walls shall not extend more than six (6) feet above the height limit **in any given zoning district**. Flagpoles, chimneys, cooling towers, electric display signs, elevator bulkheads, penthouses, finials, gas tanks, grain elevators, stacks, storage towers, radio towers, ornamental towers, monuments, cupolas, domes, spires, standpipes and necessary mechanical appurtenances ~~may be erected as to height in accordance with existing or hereafter adopted laws or ordinances of the City~~ **are exempt from height restrictions**.

Option B: Amend Article VII: "M-1" Industrial District:

A. Height. ~~Buildings or structures shall not exceed one hundred (100) feet or eight (8) stories in height.~~ **No height restriction in M-1 Zone.**

B. Rear Yards. Same as District "B-1".

C. Front Yards. Same as District "B-1". (Yard Exceptions).

D. Side Yards. Same as District "B-1".

Item V. Discussion of Comprehensive Plan Update

I would like to get volunteers for the various committees from P&Z. Not necessarily tonight but soon. I'd like to make get the appointments made in July and get started soon thereafter. I see a breakout of topics to work something like I have below.

- Land Use and Multi-modal Transportation (1 or 2 from P&Z, 1 or 2 Aldermen, 1 from Board of Adjustment?)
 - Land Use Plan
 - Transportation Plan
 - Streets
 - Sidewalks
 - Other
 - Recommendations on Future Regulations
 - Planned residential zoning districts
 - Building and sign regulations
- Utilities, Public Works and the Environment (1 or 2 from P&Z, 1 or 2 Aldermen)
 - Planned Extensions of the Water, Sewer and Electric Systems
 - Sewer Treatment
 - Solid & recycling waste collection
 - Storm water management
- Community Facilities (1 from P&Z, 1 + from Park Board, 1+ from School Board, Chamber rep, 1 from Library Board, 1 Alderman)
 - Parks, pools and recreation facilities
 - Learning
 - Schools
 - Library
 - Other
 - Health care
 - Emergency response
 - Arts, culture and history
 - Housing and property maintenance
- Financial Resources (1 from P&Z, 1 - 2 Aldermen, 1 from EEZ Board, Chamber rep, CREDI rep)
 - Revenue and expenditure projections
 - Economic development
 - Fees, taxes and utility rates

Possible Timeline

August 2015

- Organize host first meetings of full committee
- Hold initial meeting of subcommittees
- Requests for data from subcommittees

September 2015

- Second round of meetings from subcommittees
- Preliminary data and staff reports to subcommittees
- Outline for public meetings

October – November 2015

- Public meetings
- Subcommittee review of public meetings
- Additional data collection
- Second meeting of full committee
- Preliminary report to P&Z

December 2015

- Compose draft plan (Staff)
- Meeting of full committee for review
- P&Z Public Hearing

January 2016

- Board of Alderman Public Hearing and possible adoption