

**CITY OF WASHINGTON, MISSOURI**  
**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**  
**Monday, April 8th, 2024 7:00 p.m.**

The regular meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission was held on the aforementioned date and time in the Council Chambers of City Hall, located at 405 Jefferson Street in Washington, MO.

- 1) The meeting was called to order, Pledge of Allegiance, and the following roll call was taken:

**Present:** Rocco Gonzalez, Chuck Watson, John Borgmann, Mayor Hagedorn, Tom Holdmeier, Mark Piontek, Mark Kluesner, Chad Briggs, Carolyn Witt, Mike Wood, Sal Maniaci, Sarah Skeen

- 2) **Approval of the Minutes from the February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2024 meeting-** Motion made by Chuck Watson, seconded by Carolyn Witt, passed without dissent.

- 3) **File No. 24-0401-Special Use Permit-331 Olive Street-Short Term Rental-**

**Sarah Skeen-** The first item we have for you is a Special Use Permit at 331 Olive Street for short term rental. The zoning is R2 Overlay, which means that if you approve, they will get a buffer. As you can see, the buffer around the other two short term rentals in that area is some distance, I think about 50 feet. The house is here where the star is, the blue star, so you can see the space around that residence. They do have a driveway. It will fit at least two cars, Then we have on street parking. This is a visual from the front and then angle.

**Tom Holdmeier-**Any comments, questions by board? If not, is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak on this? Come on up. Please introduce yourself, your name, address.

**Wade Hall-**We live at 327 Olive Street, next door. We have a couple of questions. Number one, what is the time frame for this, when they would begin to advertise it as a short-term rental? The other thing, this may not be relevant, is how they propose to have it as a form or the whether it's AirBnB or Zillow or whatever?

**Tom Holdmeier--**I don't know if we as a board really look into that.

**Carolyn Witt-**Have you talked to them? Have you talked to the owner?

**Wade Hall-**General terms, but not specifically.

**Carolyn Witt-**I think she's here.

**Tom Holdmeier-**Any other questions or comments?

**Kate Bueke-**This is my home. Wade, to address your questions. We likely would not start using this as a short term rental until 2025. We would primarily be targeting or offering this as a residence for families with young children, having cribs available, having bikes available. It's really family-friendly, but something that we haven't really seen a lot. We have family that come from out of town, and they look for short term rentals that can accommodate small family, lots of little kids, and they've been struggling to find something. So, we were willing to. And so that means that we moved to a larger home too.

**Tom Holdmeier-**Any questions or comments by board?

**Sal Maniaci-**I think that the second question was primarily, is it Airbnb and VRBO?

**Kate Bueke**-Yes.

**Mark Kluesner**-But now the limit is still 30 days, correct?

**Sal Maniaci**-Well, so if it's over 30 days, they do not need a special use permit. So a lot of times the traveling nurses or when the bridge was being built, those were those property owners did not need a special use permit. So this is just to allow the weekend trips. Anything like that.

**Tom Holdmeier**-All right, thank you. Anyone else that would like to speak on this? If not, I'll entertain a motion. If there's no further discussion.

**Mike Wood**-Motion to approve.

**John Borgmann**-Second

**Tom Holdmeier**-All those in favor?

All-Aye.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Any opposed? So moved.

4. **File No. 23-0202-Special Use Permit RV Park-Updated Site Plan**

**Sarah Skeen**- We have the Special Use Permit for the RV park at 1550 West Main Street. Zoning is agriculture. You saw this last year and approved it. It did get extended because they didn't get it completed in the one year term. They got it extended at Council, but they're coming back with a change to the plan. It's not a major change to the footprint. It is still the same number of lots, the same number of buildings. They're struggling with rising costs of concrete, so they're asking that the hard surface be replaced with gravel, except at entrances where they will still have the concrete. So, this is a side-by-side view of what they had submitted a year ago and then what they're submitting now. I don't have any other updates.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Any questions or comments by board members?

**John Borgmann**-Yes, sir. Go ahead. First of all, if we would approve gravel that is considered a 20-foot fire lane axis that would have to meet the weight requirements for our fire lane structure, correct? Can that be achieved with gravel?

**Sal Maniaci**-Well, we have done it in the past. When River Bend Estates first got built, that same thing came up because between phase one and phase two, they asked if they could use gravel, and it was under the condition that they could meet the fire truck, the weight load of 60,000 pounds, I believe is what it was.

They were able to It's the dimensions of that or the depth of that in the specs.

**John Borgmann**-And was that on level ground or was that on elevating? I don't remember.

**Sal Maniaci**-It was fairly flat in between those two phases.

**John Borgmann**-Okay. Because that's the other concern I have, and especially on that hillside, if we get the rain we had a few weeks ago, I always guarantee you without walking on that property that there's probably water migrating through that hillside. And anytime you have that with gravel, you're going to have interior deterioration of that gravel surface just like any gravel road does when you have vehicles traveling over it, whether there are cars, and I know that the trailers or RVs aren't that heavy as the firetrucks are, but you still have had that deterioration of the roadway with gravel. I personally, from the emergency services side, would not be in favor of allowing the gravel because of that reason and long term. That's the other problem. You still have problems with the asphalt if it's not maintained, but at least you have something more solid underneath it to prevent the 2-inch-an-hour rain or the one-inch-an-hour rain that comes down in

a short period of time and washes, just look or drive around some of these other places in town where you see gravel washouts and you end up with a large amount of the gravel that's washed off the roadway onto the asphalt. That's it. My comments.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Any other questions?

**Mark Kluesner**-Yes, I have one. So, my question has a lot to do with what John just was. The water will come off of the new surface. It's not a hard surface anymore, and it will go into a nearby ditch, correct?

**Sal Maniaci**-They do show some stormwater detention in there on their plan.

**Mark Kluesner**-I think they added it on this one since they changed the surface.

**Sal Maniaci**-It is revised a little bit.

**Mark Kluesner**-I guess regardless of that, I'm sure it will run downhill towards the creek. But will that ditch have to be engineered or anything?

**Sal Maniaci**-Yeah, they will have to. With their plan, their engineer will have to certify that it's not going to have an increase of runoff per the code.

**Mark Kluesner**-It's like John said, there'll be a lot of water coming out there. So, thank you.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Any other questions or comments by board members?

**Mike Wood**-I have the same concern. It's just the slope of that lot. I think it's a perfect place for the use of this, and I was excited about when they came in with the first plan for it and now to back off this much just concerns me with no timeline for improvement. I don't want to spend other people's money because they started smaller. Over a period of time, get it there without having to use as much of the gravel or the gravel at all on this. That's my concern with it. I was very hopeful we were going to do it and do it right, and I'm concerned we're not doing it right now.

**John Borgmann**-I agree.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Anyone else on the board? Is the applicant here? If you would, please come up.

**Gregg Gross**-And the reason for the gravel versus the concrete right at this moment is you got to know the rising cost of everything. I'm trying to keep the cost down because as I mean, there's 35 spots there. It's not like a normal RV park where there's 60, 150, there's 35. So, I had to get the cost down to just... But it's not a permanent thing. I would still eventually want to do concrete because I do not want to deal with, like you guys said, always having to go out there and deal with all the rock and picking up the rock out of the grass all the time. I eventually still want to concrete. There's no question about that. I'd rather prefer the hard surface. But just to get him right now and then after dealing with everything, get it going, get it open, and then start conquering in a few years after it gets gone.

**Tom Holdmeier**-He mentioned a timeline and start with fewer slots and making it concrete. No, I think he was suggesting, can you start smaller and make it concrete and then expand?

**Gregg Gross**-We try thinking of it in phases and stuff like that, but you can't just grade one little section of the property because like you said, it's going to roll away. We're going to have it at two different angles like this, where there's a row here, where it was all flat. It's for everybody to pull right into it. And so that's for that reason. I don't know what else to say because they're going to be grading everything else to make it easier where it to be such a slope for it's right in front of there anyway. I know I tried to keep that.

**John Borgmann**-So have you looked at doing asphalt as opposed to concrete?

**Gregg Gross**-It's still just about the same as concrete right now. I even thought about chip and seal. Then I'm like, well, then I'm going to be running into the same predicament with the chip and seal rolling down on the hard surface. Then I know I'm going to have everybody yelling at me then. And it's chip and seal. But I'm like, well, if I just wait a couple of years, let it go through, then I'll start doing all the paths. Because I looked into other RV parts, most of the RV parts were gravel. But then when they go to the concrete on the path, they actually upcharge. I didn't know that until I started looking into it for them. And I'm not going to be in a concrete fit at the moment, but it's a premium spot. There's 35. I'm not worried about it. I'm just worried about trying to get this through so we can go in a nice spot.

**Carolyn Witt**-John, I have a question because I know nothing about this. But if the gravel... I did have a friend that lived on a gravel driveway. She lived off the bottom road across the river in Augusta. They had to constantly work on their driveway because it would... It was the dips to keep it from all disappearing. I know about that. If this is maintained, will that...

**John Borgmann**-The problem I have with that, first of all, you're going to have to, I call it or camel hump, a road like this because of the elevation, correct?

**Gregg Gross**-I don't think so. It's pretty flat. They graded and everything?

**John Borgmann**-This doesn't show elevations on it, so we can't tell that.

That would be my concern there is the change in elevation of it.

**Carolyn Witt**-That's how their driveway was. But I sympathize with him that that's an expense. But at the same time, okay, I recognize this, too. But I was thinking, if he's aware of this and that it has to be maintained until he's able to go in.

**John Borgmann**-But I don't know that there's any guarantee that we can put that into the. So, he could build it with gravel and we could say concrete within... He could tell us concrete within five years, but there's no guarantee that he can get that. I know.

**Mark Piontek**-That's correct. What's the zoning on this property, Sal?

**Sal Maniaci**-Agriculture. I know AG itself does allow gravel, but the original special use permit ordinance had the plan attached to said hard surface. This is really just an amendment to the existing site plan. Because that was our first thought, too. It's like, well, if it's in AG, you may not have to, but the original plan did say hard surface. At that point, once you're changing, let's attach the ordinance.

**Mike Wood**-Did it go to the council first?

**Sarah Skeen**-Not the change.

**Darren Lamb**-The original went to the council to extend the original.

**Mark Kluesner**-I think since the majority of the gravel is going to be on the level pads, that would really help. If you compact it, the major problem would be the road, which you have access us to grade that anytime because there's nothing parked on it. That would make the maintenance a lot easier with the pads being level and the gravel being down into the ground a little bit instead of just on top. **Gregg Gross**-They dig it down.

**Mark Kluesner**-I don't think you have a whole lot of washout if it's done that way. I don't think you'll have a whole lot of washout on those level pads if it's done that way.

**John Borgmann**-The Mayor and I were just looking at the numbers, and it looks like it drops about 95 feet from the center of the back lot where lot 13 and 14 would be down to the main



entrance. In my opinion, that's not very level. Just so the commission...unless that is the length of the property. Which that might be, too, come to think of it, because I don't see any terrain on it. Is there any way that we could get terrain grades shown on here?

**Sal Maniaci**-I think BFA has it for you. Because you submitted a grading plan.

**John Borgmann**-Do we have that here as part of this?

**Sal Maniaci**-I don't have it available. Our engineering department approved a grading plan for it.

**John Borgmann**-I mean, that might have some bearing on from what I'm hearing. I'm not sure it would change my mind.,

**Mike Wood**-I agree with you. The pads are not my concern. I'm not worried about the runoff of the pads because those, obviously, you got to keep level. It's your roadways throughout there that...

**Gregg Gross**-They have got to be maintained.

**Mike Wood**-They got it right. I sympathize with you. I'm rooting for you. Believe me.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Any questions or comments by board? All right. Thanks. Is there anyone else that would like to comment on this? Any further discussion by board?

**John Borgmann**-The only question I would have, is there a timeline here that he has to have it reviewed or approved since the first one was a little over a year ago? We have to have this acted on tonight, or do we have some time that we could get the grading plan and look at that to see what the.

**Sal Maniaci**-Yes. Council approved a year extension in February, this February. They have till February '25 to have it substantially complete.

**John Borgmann**-So, one more month. Could we have the grading plan next month to look at?

**Tom Holdmeier**-You can make that motion.

**John Borgmann**-That's what I'm asking if that's possible.

**Sal Maniaci**-I know the grading plan was submitted and I know BFA has it.

**John Borgmann**-I would make a motion to table till next month to review the grading plan. I'll second.

**Tom Holdmeier**-All those in favor?

All-Aye.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Any opposed? So moved.

**Sal Maniaci**-This will be on the May agenda then. We'll have Sarah check with Charles to see what we have on file. If not, we'll contact you to get.

**Mike Wood**-I'll tell you something else. It may not hurt you a bit to bring somebody from BFA in there to help address some of the concerns we have. Because if they've done the work on it already from their point of view, it may help your case is what I'm saying.

**Tom Holdmeier**-So, it's tabled till next month, and we'll review that plan.

**Gregg Gross**-After that, then I can start getting all the bids there.

**Sal Maniaci**-Well, it'd go to Council. They go to Council on May 20<sup>th</sup>.

5. **R-2 Overlay Code Amendment- Sarah Skeen**-We have R2, two family district and an overlay district on that. The purpose of that R2 district is to allow for the development of two-family dwellings as infill in certain parts of the City of Washington. Currently, the minimum depth of the front yard set back is 25 feet. The minimum size of a lot that you can build a single family

home on is 10,000 square feet. Then if you are going to build a two family, it's 12,000 with a max coverage of 35% well, and I'll show you in a couple of slides, most of these parcels that are in the R2 overlay district are small. There are 7,000 on the bigger end, not very large lots. We have homes that are in disrepair that need to be torn down, but nobody wants to do it because what are you going to build on it? You have lots that are empty. Nobody wants to do anything with them because what are you going to build on it to make a profit. We're proposing that we change the setback, mostly because most of those homes are from a time period where they were a lot closer to the street and the sidewalk. Then with the new code, we pushed those newer homes back, and it's got this zigzag, just disjointed look in the neighborhood. So, we're trying to bring that back. And then changing the family lot size to a 6,000-square-foot across the board. So, whether it's single family or two family, you can put on 6,000 square foot lot. And then just for the sake of sanity, if you look at a lot of those lots, we're not meeting the 35% lot coverage. It's a I shouldn't say crapshoot, but we got all kinds of stuff being built on these lots, and it's hard to enforce, and it doesn't make any sense when you have those setbacks anyway. Here are some examples. These two lots here with the red stars, a lot of people come in at least once a week saying, What can I build there? What can I build there? And we have to tell them single family home because they're both... Well, one 7,000, one is a little over 6,000 square feet. And that's not good because they're not going to make a profit on that. You can also see 601 Locust. It's set back really far. So again, it makes the neighborhood look a little out of whack. But the surrounding homes, and I measured that, I didn't go out there with a ruler, but I went and used my GIS tool. And it's about 12 feet on Sixth Street. And then on Locust, you can see it's 10 to 6 feet from the street. So, to bring those houses back forward makes more sense in those districts. Then, of course, you can see some of the lot sizes, like across the street, you've got some pretty large buildings on a smaller lot. Again, you just have a variety of types of buildings on different size lots, but none of the lots are very big to actually accommodate two family development. Then I went ahead and pulled a Google map picture of that one house that's in question, and you can see it just doesn't fit with the neighborhood. Then there's a vacant lot next to it.

**Carolyn Witt**-There are huge neighborhoods in the city where they're doing infill. Some of these infill houses are not huge, and a lot isn't huge, but these new houses are gorgeous. Of course, they're expensive. Kirkwood is a scary place. But I think this would really open up some development in an existing neighborhood. Not everybody wants to go out and go into a neighborhood where it's all new. A lot of times you have a certain charm. If you can build new in an existing footprint... My brother He built a house on... No, 314. Anyway, it was Stafford, and there was a pipe, and the city moved the pipe because it wasn't buildable. He built a small one car garage, one bedroom house, which he had no trouble selling because not everybody wants huge. I think this is great. I think this is a good idea.

**Rocco Gonzalez**-I think it's aligned with at least, we're the next comprehensive plan, making things very equitable, diverse. I mean, especially if you're looking at that lot to say that people are already willing to buy it and redo it, and we just have this current code that doesn't allow that. I mean, we're arm barring ourselves.

**Carolyn Witt**-You're right. That's exactly what we're talking about.

**John Borgmann**-Sarah, can you go back to the slide that had the comparisons, please? The only concern I have is the depth of front yard being 10 feet. If it's going to be on an intersection. If

you look at, go back to that map again, if you would, where the star is 601 Locust. We allow that to go 10 feet lot line, correct?

**Sal Maniaci**-We already have in our code a site triangle code where you have to be, you draw 20 feet back from the intersection. And draw a triangle. Everything has to be out of that. Fencing.

**John Borgmann**-So, that would all under the proposal.

**Sal Maniaci**-Yes, at all intersections. That's in our supplementary section for all development. There's a site triangle. And it's 20 by 20, and you draw a line between the two.

**John Borgmann**-Then the other question, if we reduce the size of the lots and now they have two homes on it, does the code still cover the distance between side lots, property lines, so we have the distance between the buildings maintaining the same and not have to get houses closer together? Because if you get closer together, you have higher density. I'll just say an example. The duplex catches fire. Next thing you know, it's three foot from the property line. Now you have an exposure.

**Mike Wood**-I don't think they were going to build two structures on that 6,000 square foot.

**John Borgmann**-No, but you would have two residents because you're allowing a duplex. One up, one down. Okay. I was just saying it's going to be more structured.

**Sal Maniaci**-The side yard setback is not changing. They'll still be 12 feet between.

**John Borgmann**-Still 12 feet. Okay. That answers my question.

**Sal Maniaci**-I think the only thing I want to add to Sarah is that there's not a ton in the R2 overlay, there's not a ton of vacant lots, but this has been a common question. Sarah has been more proactive about it than I was that people come and say, well, at the sale of those, that's only going to work if we can put one up, one down. Right now, you have to do single family. When you look at our two overlay, that's the whole point is to allow that mix of single family or not what I call a duplex. Where they're side by side. It's where you got an A and a B unit, One Up, One Down.

**John Borgmann**-Two family like we have in a lot of older homes around town. Correct. Okay.

**Darren Lamb**-The question I've got is to make sure that we don't address, I guess, where front entry garages so that they're not we've had situations where people at homes, closer to the street, try to go in and match it, and they end up putting a driveway in the front of the garage, and the cars are getting out there in front of the sidewalk. I don't think you want to continue that. I guess that'd be my own concern if we don't have anything in it instead of that. So, most of the new construction you see, they don't really... They have front-end garages. And I guess that would be my own concern is do we have anything that.. That 25-foot setback is always there. I'm not going to argue that because I agree. So we made those changes years ago to start to look really, and I think it's good. But that 25-foot setback always accommodated the vehicle. So, it wouldn't be set. I just don't want to have a situation where we tell the developer is out there, build a front entrance garage and the car is sitting over the side of the walk. I don't know if we need to put something in addition to this.

**Sal Maniaci**-You could put in there 10 feet unless you have front entrance, unless you have a driveway, then it has to be, I think, 19 feet is what our parking space is, 9 by 19.

**Mark Kluesner**-That will also be reviewed by the building department, right? So couldn't they make that decision?

**Tom Holdmeier**-Well, we should have something like that. We should have something that says it.

**Sal Maniaci**-Have it codified. It's always good. To be honest, sometimes in a site plan, they won't show a driveway because in this area, they don't all have driveways, and then they'll put it in later.

**John Borgmann**-Do we have areas like this that have sidewalks? I don't think this area has sidewalks currently.

**Sal Maniaci**-We have plenty. Plenty of R2 overlay has sidewalks.

**John Borgmann**-That's what I thought. I think that's a valid point, Darren, if we can incorporate that somehow into this.

**Sal Maniaci**-That could be an easy change.

**Sarah Skeen**-And you can see on the house on Locust Street, they have the house 6 feet to the street or to the sidewalk. And then the garage is back, further back.

**Sal Maniaci**-On the side?

**Darren Lamb**-Or even that house that's on the corner of sixth of Walnut for example. The driveway comes in from the house of Sixth. That's right. Or typically, what you see in those neighborhood, they've got a single driveway that goes inside of the house.

**Tom Holdmeier**-And garages in the rear.

**Sal Maniaci**-And much of our two overlay has alley access as well. But, yes, if you're going to have some infill you want to protect from that. So you're right in.

**Mayor Hagedorn**-Guys, it goes about saying anything we can do to improve something, a house that you can walk to town is a good thing, and this does that.

**Carolyn Witt**-Is there something we can put in to address that?

**Mike Wood**-Can we approve with the change that was mentioned?

**Sal Maniaci**-Conditionalize it to say that 10 feet unless it has driveway access in the front, then it must be 20 for the garage. The setback has to be 20.

**Darren Lamb**-Do we have any contracts on any of these lots?

**Sarah Skeen**-No.

**Sal Maniaci**-Well, no. We have condemned this house and we gave them 60 days to tear it down. Sixty days are up. The buyer that they have that would tear it down and build on it is contingent on tonight.

**Darren Lamb**-Well, I think that they can probably still. I think everybody's going to be agreeing to move in this direction.

**Sal Maniaci**-Yes. Right. That's why I'm okay with the- We'll get the language- With the condition on it.

**Darren Lamb**-We'll get the language right at council then. I guess Like I said, we just got to put something in there so you know. I just see that too many times where houses built in the '70s, '80s, and they built those, and they built... They tried to match the front set back, but then somebody still put that front end drop, and it is an inconvenience for people to walk out in the traffic and walk back.

**Mark Kluesner**-Now, on the percentage of lot coverage, the 35% that you're eliminating, will that change at all? Will you put a new percentage in?

**Sarah Skeen**-That's up to you.

**Mark Kluesner**-Okay. What about the square footage on these two family buildings? Is that going to be a maximum on that?

**Sal Maniaci**-The reason we didn't have a percentage in there is because you already have setbacks, and then the accessory structure cannot be larger than the square footage of your home. That protects you from building a house and then a huge accessory structure in the back. As long as you meet setbacks. The pool and the shed would count as two.

**John Borgmann**-Percentage Which I understand eliminating that because how do you, as a staff, go out and measure that on every one that you're going to-. As long as we have the setbacks like we talked, I'm fine with that.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to speak on this? If there's no further discussion, I'll entertain a motion.

**Mark Kluesner**-I'll make a motion to pass it with the condition.

**Rocco Gonzalez**-Second.

**Tom Holdmeier**-All those in favor?

**All**-Aye.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Any opposed? So moved.

6. **Public Hearing-Comprehensive Plan-Short Term Goals- Sal Maniaci**-We had the workshop before this. We talked about the short term goals. We're going to have two of these. The first one tonight, and then Council would have that same presentation given to them. We would then ask Council for a resolution of support. Then we can bring it back in May. Really, tonight is just to show in the minutes and when we bring it to adoption that we had two more opportunities for the public to comment on this.

Thank you all. Part 2 Second time today. My name is Tim Breihan, Principal with H3 Studio. And we've been pleased to have worked with the City of Washington over the past, approximately 18 months, on developing the 2035 Comprehensive Plan update. I'm going to quickly run through the presentation we went through a little bit more detail at the work session earlier for the benefit of the public hearing this evening, really with focus on, as Sal was mentioning, the community vision strategies, the summary of the future land use plan, and then the implementation action items. So again, this plan was developed over the course of 18 months with a pretty extensive community engagement process that consisted of a series of three stakeholder focus groups early on the process, two business order round table meetings. The city needed a project steering committee, whom we met with five times throughout the process. And then a key points in the process, the visioning phase, the development of draft recommendations, and the development of final recommendations. We also had three large public workshops that were well-attended, typically between 35 and 50 community members in attendance of each of those workshops. And then an online comprehensive plan survey that was available on the city's website, 394 for total responses to that survey, of which 343 were Washington residents. So, we were very pleased with the overall level of engagement and the number of individuals within the community that we're able to provide and put on the plan. Coming out of that community engagement process, there were a series of key community priorities that were identified, and these were identified, again, based specifically on community feedback, resident and stakeholder feedback. Those include the



need for workforce development, housing, diversity, and affordability, road improvements, and congestion mitigation in Washington, particularly on Highway 47 and Highway 100, enhancements to the Fifth Street corridor, continued work on downtown Washington and riverfront development, diversifying the city's jobs base, enhancing park, trails, and recreation amenities, developing the East West Parkway road system south of Highway 100, and finally, ensuring effective implementation of the comp plan. So, developing a plan in such a way that it's really set up to be implemented by the city from day one. And those community priorities really formed the basis of how the various recommendations of the comp plan update were developed. So, the recommendations were developed to address those priorities, in particular.

The recommendations for the comp plan consists of an overall vision statement, a series of goals and strategies, and then a variety of recommendations for the future land use plan and other physical facilities and infrastructure within Washington, so we'll quickly run through each of those. The community vision statement states that Washington will leverage its rich history, riverfront environment, and economic development success to position itself as an innovative and regionally recognized, complete community, to support regional cooperation, a highly-skilled workforce, a diverse economy, and a vibrant high quality life for current and future residents. And again, just to reiterate that this idea of a complete community was very important in the community engagement process. The fact that the committee members and the members of the public did not want to only focus on tourism or only focus on housing or only focus on jobs, but to focus on all of those things and developing an integrated community with great communities that supports principally the residents of Washington. So that's very important. I mean, that serves as an overall guiding principle. That vision statement is then supported by a series of seven goals, each of which has subsidiary strategies for implementation. We'll run through those now by one. Not all the strategies, of course, but seven goals.

1. So, the first goal, community history and regional distinction. Washington will celebrate its community history of entrepreneurship, resiliency, and its location in the Missouri River by enhancing its regional identity and connection to become a vibrant regional destination.
2. Goal two, economic diversity and application. Washington will build and apply its current economy to diversify and attract new businesses by providing training programs, support, and the members target towards a well-educated and highly skilled workforce.
3. Goal three, downtown expansion and enhancement. Washington will expand their fine footprint downtown to strengthen its identity within the city. You can you enhance downtown by developing surrounding areas such as Fifth Street as a part of downtown.
4. Goal four, Housing Development and Diversification. Washington will provide a diversity of housing types, inclusive of workforce and entry-level housing to accommodate the next

generation of young families, professionals, and workers, as well as future growth in the community.

5. Goal Five, Transportation and Infrastructure. Washington will improve its overall major road connectivity, city gateways, and expand infrastructure and utility services in future development areas as well as improve existing infrastructure to accommodate continued development within city limits.
6. Goal number six, natural resources, parks, and recreation. Washington will capitalize on its riverfront and other natural resources to enhance and expand park and recreation opportunities, improve and expand walkability, bikeability, and create a safer, healthier, and more desirable environment for all citizens and visitors.
7. Goal number seven, governmental progress goal number seven. Washington will commit to the current and future governmental members to actively strive for inter-jurisdictional cooperation, relationship building, and efforts to advance the goals of the Washington Community Washington Community Parties and the Comprehensive Plan.

And so these seven goals include 54 individual strategies, again, that are subsidiary to each of the goals. And those strategies are actionable items that the city and partners can move forward with, and those form the basis of the implementation plan that we will get to in just a moment. So, in addition to the policy and programming recommendations that those strategies contain, the comp plan also contains the future land use plan, as well as physical facilities plans for city infrastructure. And the recommendations of those plans also serve to fulfill some of the strategies that are under each of those goals. So, we'll quickly run through what is planned right now.

Starting with the future land use plan. Obviously, this sets out a vision for the future physical development of Washington. We're using a system that we refer to as community place types. And fundamentally, what this does is it links land use with overall development character. So, character of the built environment. So this is a qualitative land use strategy, and it's organized around a series of these community place types. There are part 12, individual community place types in total. Starting out with open space, parks, and natural features, which form the basic framework for development within Washington. Obviously, the Washington's historical settlement, based on its riverfront location, its topography, the creeks, are very important. And today, those systems orchestrate the majority of Washington's outdoor and park recreational amenities. Then there is a system of civic, commercial, and mixed-use amenities, employment centers, from the commercial retail corridors to the industrial commercial areas, downtown, the various institutions, and smaller neighborhood scale retail and commercial areas. And so these really form the edges and centers of residential districts or neighborhoods within Washington. Interestingly, this is a pattern that has occurred organically over time, but we feel it's important.

And working with the city, they felt it was important as well to make sure that the plan reinforces that because that is such an integral part of Washington's built character.

And then finally, a series of three different types of residential areas and subdivisions which actually form the fabric of those neighborhoods. So, that is the future land use plan. One thing And to note on page 5.5 of the plan document, there is a table that correlates the land use categories or the place types as it were with existing residential or existing zoning districts. Essentially within this, what you'll see is that in order to achieve the future land use plan as it's presented in the comp plan, there would essentially going to need to be four key modifications made to the city zoning code, updating two existing zoning districts and creating two new overlay districts. But one of the strengths of this Community Place type system is that it does naturally set up those zoning code updates because of the way that ties the land use to the built environment. Two quick examples of that would be covered in greater detail in the work session, the mixed-use innovation overlay district. In the comp plan document, there is presented a whole series of detailed recommendations about both building location as well as uses within that overlay to be able to support the development of new advanced manufacturing businesses within in Washington.

And likewise, the Type 5 general mixed-use district, which covers the city's major corridor commercial areas, such as along Highway 100. Because the comp plan calls it out as a feature mixed-use district and calls for permitting mixed-use development within that area, which is today a strictly commercial area, The comp plan illustrates some ways in which that evolution of those areas could occur over time with different types of mixed-use development. So, that is the future land use plan. And then the future land use plan is also supported by three physical facilities plans. Again, these are the infrastructure plans of the city. There is a streets and roads plan, which calls out various qualitative improvements, streetscape, public realm, public facilities improvements to keep roadways and street corridors within Washington to help achieve the vision of the future land use plan. There's a Parks, Trails, and Open Space plan, which recommends enhancements to the existing city park facilities, the expansion of city parks, the city park network with some new facilities, including a large scale outdoor sports recreation complex, which is indicated on some of the vacant ground city current owns at the Washington airport. And then also recommendations for trail and Greenway connectivity throughout the city.

And then finally, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Plan looks at all of the various bike and pedestrian facility types, including both on-street facility types like bike lanes and shared lanes, as well as off-street types like Greenway and Trail Connections, and it actually provides recommended alignments and facility types for each of those depending on their location. Important to note that these things are not set in stone, but they are, again, designed to provide actionable recommendations that the city can use to identify projects and then connect projects with available funding resources, including grants. Having this call out plan with a fairly high degree of specificity makes it much easier for communities to access different funding mechanisms for implementation.

And so that segues into the implementation strategic action plan, which is the final chapter of the comp plan document. And that section consists of basically three components. There are a series of seven early action items that are identified first. And these are items that through A new discussion with the city, based on community priorities, are things that would be very important in setting the stage for ongoing implementation, either by establishing regulatory policy frameworks, initiating heat catalytic projects, and in general, helping to build momentum towards plan implementation and actually demonstrate to community and stakeholders that the plan is being followed.

Then the second section is the implementation matrix, which essentially takes all the 54 strategies that were identified with the associated goals and it assigned defines them a time horizon for implementation, either a short term, zero to three years, medium term, three to seven years, long term, seven years, greater, as well as responsible parties for implementation And then finally, short term implementation action items take the short term strategies from the overall implementation matrix and provide additional detail about how the city can move forward achieving those recommendations. So, to quickly go over the seven early action items that are presented first in that chapter. Those

1. Number one, to establish an outcome reporting system to provide a way for the city staff, the Planning Zoning Commission, other elected officials, and the community to be in communication about what's being done and what's been completed, helping to maintain accountability for plan implementation.
2. Number two, completing those strategic updates to the city's zoning code. Again, basically making two updates to existing zoning districts and then establishing two new overlay districts.
3. Number three, establishing a high-tech education and job training facility in Washington in partnership with an existing educational institution That could be East Central College, it could be State Tech Lynn, Rankin.

It hasn't been determined who that would be yet, but basically getting a branch location open in Washington. That was something that came up through the engagement process and really gained a lot of traction with both the Steering Committee as well as the public as a key way of helping to diversify and ensure that Washington's jobs base is future ready and continues to be competitive.

4. Number four, developing a downtown master plan, Fifth Street master plan, inclusive of a conference partner strategy.
5. Number five, completing phase one of the East-West Parkway, based based on the site, basically on either side of Highway 47.
6. Number six, continuing to pursue strategic annexation of land around Washington, focused primarily on the East West Parkway implementation, as well as any potential annexation that might be required for the s

7. Seventh early action items, which is the development of an outdoor evidence complex, which currently has been identified our city-owned land at the airport site.

Those are the seven early action items. Most of them, the first five, essentially are intended to be completed within... Well, actually, they're all really intended to be completed to some extent or another within seven years of plan implementation.

So these would be the top priority items that the city should look at over the term of the comprehensive plan. The implementation matrix, it's far too detailed to go through one by one, but I'll explain how it is structured. So, this is organized according to the comprehensive plan goals. So, the goal is going first. Then under each of the goals are first, then under each of the goals are the goals' constituent strategies. And for each strategy, there is an assessment of the collective impact of that strategy on each of those nine peak media priorities we'll talk about at the beginning. So, the strategies are assessed by either having a primary action, a secondary action in effect, or an indirect effect on each of those peak media priorities. Then there's an implementation time frame, short term, medium term or long term. And finally, there's a list of the departments and/or other organizations that would be responsible for implementing each of those strategies. And then finally, four, again, strategies in the implementation matrix that have been classified as short term, which is zero to three years. Those are then further detailed in the implementation action. So, in this section, those strategies are actually organized according to the city of Washington Department that would be the primary implementer of that strategy. And then under the department is listed the short term plan strategy. In some cases, as you can see on the screen, there are subtasks. So, the strategy might need to be broken up into several items. And so each of those subtasks is listed. Then there's the department that is primarily responsible for implementation listed in the next column. And that actually can vary between the primary strategy and if there are subtasks, there might be different primary implementers or subtasks, even though there's, in this case, economic development and responsible for the overall strategy. Then there are potential partners listed. These could be other city departments or it could be third-party organizations or entities. And then finally for the strategy and for each of the potential subtasks, if those exist, there are time frames for implementation measured in months and years. So, what this really is intended to do is when a every department is putting together its annual budget, for instance. The Economic Development Department, as an example, they can go to the plan and they can see everything that has been earmarked in the plan that they are entirely responsible for, so they can use that for planning. It's intended that that be used for planning for at least three years. And again, in conjunction with the outcome reporting system, then that would allow them to check off things as they get completed. Just to be perfectly clear, these were developed in conjunction and with review from all of the applicable city departments that are identified as potential people there. So city staff, department heads, have weighed in on these recommendations. So with that, I will turn it back for the comments from the public.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Any comments? Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak on this? Please introduce yourself, your address.

**Charles Schroepfer**-I live at 1701 East Rose Lane. I was at the last comprehensive plan when it was with John. It was a disaster. There was a question asked then, and I'm going to ask that



tonight. I was excited to get an answer. How can you put this comprehensive plan in the county, like Franklin County or Warren County? And then you annex, say five years or who knows, ten years from now, say, okay, this comprehensive plan is in force. And if you don't like the comprehensive plan, then you have to go ahead and amend it. It's almost like putting zoning on their property now. And then when they get annexed into the city, then you come along and say, well, you don't like the zoning. You got to go through planning and zoning and change it. It's like an extra hurdle you have to do. Is there a law that allows you to go ahead and put this in the county on other piece of property without damaging you? Are you damaging these people's property? How could the comprehensive plan on that property when they're not in the city?

**Mark Piontek**-We litigated that very similar issue some years ago when we developed the East West Parkway Plan, which predominantly was outside of the city limits. It was out in the county, in the unincorporated Franklin County. At that time, the Court said, yes, we had the authority to plan for future development, not only within the city limits, but outside of the city limits.

**Charles Schroepfer**-But when they did that East West Parkway, it was probably it had to be, begin in the city and go through the county and back into the city.

**Mark Piontek**-Because the statute specifically talked about roadways leading to and from the city. But we're not just designing roadways now. We're talking about the comprehensive planning for the city, both now and in the future.

**Charles Schroepfer**-I know, but what all are you doing right to go ahead and put this on somebody's property in the county and not damage their property?

**Mark Piontek**-We're not doing anything to anybody's property. It's a future map, a future plan for how the city anticipates growing both within the city limits and outside of the city limits into the future.

**Charles Schroepfer**-Again, if somebody owns this piece of property, can't they see this on there? They might not be able to sell their property.

**Mark Piontek**-Well, you show me a concrete example where that's occurred. **Charles Schroepfer**-Well, e give you a not that it occurred. I don't know if it occurred before, but if somebody's land is staying or using the commercial today and they're in the county and this plan shows it as residential. Then once they get annexed in the city to be residential in the plan and to change the plan, and to change the plan you have to amend it. That's what we did in the past. So, if somebody wants to buy this commercial property that's in the county and it goes into the city later, they might not want to buy it. Are you damaging that person's property today?

**Mark Piontek**-No.

**Sal Maniaci**-And I look at the map, that scenario does not exist in this proposal. There's not any existing commercial property that's proposed to be residential. It's all on the highway.

**Mayor Hagedorn**-Charlie, I could not disagree with more about this being an important plan? It has helped me since I have become Mayor every decision we make about land or whatever, Darren, Sal, and I say, does it fit the comprehensive plan? Everybody in this town could have influence and input into that comprehensive plan. Would you have no plans at all going willy-nilly about?

**Charles Schroepfer**-No, I understand a plan for the future, but if you're putting a plan in another area, how would you like us to plan that the county would put a comprehensive plan in the city

and say, we want less residential, we want more commercial so we can get the tax, and more industrial so we can get more people coming in and more jobs.

**Tom Holdmeier**-When they come in, we decide how they're coming into the city limits. Even though we may say it's commercial, they may want R1 whatever, and we allow it for whatever reason. But we're just saying in general, this is what we see as the future. So, people that are buying the property also know where are the potential uses that the city is seeing, and in the county, too. It helps everyone.

**Charles Schroepfer**-I understand you need a plan that gives you what you want to do. But when you put this on somebody's property that is not in the city, and then when you annex them into the city, you say you have to amend that comprehensive plan if you want to change this comprehensive plan.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Darren, do you know that ever happening? I mean, if they are commercial, they'll usually come in commercial, right? I can address them. Okay. All right. Anything else? Thank you. Anyone else that would like to speak on this? Darren, if you want to come up. Yeah, I don't I can cite an example.

**Darren Lamb**-Typically, it's been 10 years since the city has put an annexation that it's run out. So it's been a long time. Most of the stuff we get is voluntary annexation. We work with those developers. They know what we expect of them. And it's a lot of it is the voluntary annexation. You've seen this road country, the road that you've seen in the south of sport. You guys haven't got to tell me about it. So they pretty well know that That's the type of land use that we expect in those areas. I do not remember the last time we had a conflict with that, to be quite honest. I'm not saying that there couldn't be, but I think it's just a matter of us to make sure that if somebody had proposed a use that was going to be another monthly burden on our utilities, this is the whole reason why we plan for this stuff, so we make sure that that doesn't happen. I will make a comment about something that's a little bit different that we talked about with staff this afternoon, and we talked about it throughout this whole process. And then earlier draft, Tim had some maps that showed different levels of density for residential, and it got much more greater detail than what you see on the maps tonight.

We have typically in the past, this is my third comprehensive plan that we've had a city. We typically have had residential here, commercial here, mixed use here, et cetera, those uses, and not, I guess, I want to say, backed ourselves into a corner. So, one of the concerns we had when we saw those density determinations, I guess, is like, okay, what is high density? What is low density? Define. You know what I mean? And so, in this case, what we got is basically the low density areas that you have are 7,500 square feet or more. And anything less than that is a higher density residential use, which is what you were talking about, the R2 overlay, which goes around, in and out, downtown, etc. So, I just wanted to show you that that is a change a little bit of what we have done in the past in comprehensive plans, because that's going to make a difference when a developer comes in here and they come in and they're standing before you. And again, they're going to be voluntarily annexing the property because they want to hire the utilities. Typically, that's the reason why they're coming. And then they're going to go ahead and say, well, I want this site's development. Well, there may be neighbors that disagree with that, they're going to point to that comprehensive plan and say, Hey, wait a second. What is your

plan? So that's the reason why the city has been open to that in the past in their comprehensive plan with regards to density requirements. It just said residential. They have just said residential, period. It didn't say single family, two family, multiple family. You have done this a little bit more on this map than we have in the previous plans. But like I said, there's nothing wrong with that. It's just a matter of fact, I wanted you to be aware of that so that if you do have a development, we have a voluntary annexation, and they come in and they want to say they want to widen that area, maybe where they want to put some multiple family in, so people may be going to that plan. I know that the language on there is preferred, and that's one of the things that, like I said, we want to make sure that's on. I just want to make you guys aware of that, that the front change.

**Mike Wood**-Here's the one example that I could see, and I think it can be worked out. Let's say you continue to have that residential growth, and the school district comes in and says, and it's not the case, but let's say we need a school. So, they're going to identify a spot out by the residential growth and say, we need a school out in this area. They're going to work with everybody involved, but that would be a perfect opportunity for us to come back in and amend the plan and say, because of the growth, we need this, then we could do that. Exactly. That would be the one example that I would... I mean, it's far fetched, I think, in the next 10 years.

**Carolyn Witt**-I think the parks is the same way that a demand as you're expanding, you don't want to drop the ball on having parks. The same thing. A quality of life The school district, the parks.

**John Borgmann**-There would be justification for the cause.

**Mark Kluesner**-Keep them coming to.

**Mike Wood**-And we wouldn't stand in the way of it happening because- No, no.

**Darren Lamb**-It's flexible. It has to be a living, breathing document. We've had changes before. Changes of where we had to visit in situations because the contracts of plan showed the different land use and It just makes sense to go down the path.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Thank you. Any further discussion by board?

**Mayor Hagedorn**-Folks, everybody knows the amount of people that have contributed to this. But Sal, this is your baby. You've given us a really dynamite document, if you ask me, and I know it'll help me going forward.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Thank you. Thank you for your service to the community and this commission, especially.

**Mike Wood**-I'm assuming then the next steps on this will be Council for a recommendation back to us for approval or will next month for us?

**Darren Lamb**-Next month for you guys first to go ahead and adopt the plan and then..

**Sal Maniaci**-They have to be last because city council technically does not even have to approve it.

**Darren Lamb**-We've historically always asked for them first.

**Mike Wood**-To make a recommendation back to us for approval. We make recommendations to them. This is the one time.

**Darren Lamb**-You guys adopt us.

**Mike Wood**-We're looking for that next month, I guess, is my question?

**Sal Maniaci**-Ideally, there's two council meetings in between here and your next meeting. One of those council would have the same presentation and have a resolution of support, and then in May, you can adopt this. If you have any changes that come up after looking at tonight, just if we can get them to us or Tim as quickly as possible so we can have those on there.

**John Borgmann**-I'm content.

**Tom Holdmeier**-Entertain one last motion.

Motion to the Adjourn.

Second.

**Tom Holdmeier**-All those in favor?

All-Aye.

**Tom Holdmeier**-So moved.

**Motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m., first and second, passed without dissent.**



**Thomas R. Holdmeier**

**Chairperson**

**Planning & Zoning Commission**