

**Columbia Special Business District
Board of Directors Meeting
February 13, 2007, 4:00 p.m.
11 S. Tenth Street**

Present:

Mary Wilkerson, Boone County National Bank
Skip Walther, Walther, Antel, Stamper & Fischer, PC
Mike Vangel, Vangel Marketing Communications
Rosie Gerding, Gerding, Korte, & Chitwood
Carrie Gartner, Executive Director

Blake Danuser, Bingham's
Leigh Lockhart, Main Squeeze
John Ott, The Tiger-Downtown
Mark Timberlake, Timberlake Engineering
Leslie Gale, Assistant Director

Absent:

Chuck Wilms, Engagement Ring Center

Guests:

Kevin Coleman, Columbia Daily Tribune
Ted Curtis, PedNet
Larry Colgin, CCA Board
Linda Rootes, North Central Columbia Neighborhood
Katie Micik, Columbia Missourian
Gary Kesphol, Central Missouri Computer

Paul Land, Plaza Real Estate
Tim Teddy, Planning & Zoning
Deb Sheals, Historic Consultant
Brittney Darwell, Columbia Missourian
Jen Jarvis, KOMU-TV
Officer Buck, Columbia PD

Call to Order

Ott called the meeting to order.

Approval of minutes

Vangel made a motion to accept the January minutes. Wilkerson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Financial Report

Gartner reported that SBD received some income directly from the County, which is actually a City Appropriation. We expect to get a large amount from the City shortly. She noted that the reason it appears to be over-budget on health insurance is because Gale is paying the SBD back for one month's payment, and there will be a \$200 overage because of the employment overlap of Wyllys-Gambiza and Gale, which was beneficial to the office. She also stated that in the "printing" line item, we are over-budget and will continue to be due to an increased number of mailings.

Vangel made a motion to approve the January financials. Danuser seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Guest Presentations

Ted Curtis, Connecting Columbia – Curtis gave a presentation on the general concept of the Connecting Columbia Project. He stated that at this point he is looking for an endorsement from the board and that at this point there is nothing controversial about the plan. He gave the board examples of the different parts of the project that they would like to see happen and showed them maps of where bike lanes and other pieces of the project would be put in. They have based their estimates on Portland, Oregon, a larger city that recently enacted a similar plan. He stated that the first step of the plan, after approval from City Council, will be to try small things in places throughout Columbia to see how they work. He stated that one of their main goals, especially in the downtown area, will be to not have a net loss of parking when they are creating bike lanes. One way they might do this will be to use back-in diagonal parking, which is much safer for bikers.

Gartner stated that the most common questions about biking for *The District* are the need for more bike parking and how to get bikes off sidewalks. Ott stated that as he understands the goals of PedNet, they are to get people to ride their bikes for leisure if they don't ride at all currently and if they already do that, to get them to ride to work and asked what kinds of things they will do to accomplish that. Curtis answered that they will be doing promotions with local media, and will try to concentrate their efforts in the downtown area first because of the higher population density. Vangel asked how the location of one-way bike paths will be determined. Curtis answered that they have chosen some sites already based on where commuters, and those already biking to work, will most likely go based on landscape. Gartner asked if the board were to give its endorsement, would PedNet come back for approval of any details. Curtis answered that yes, that would be their course of action.

Vangel expressed concern with endorsing the concept without further discussion about it. Walther stated that because it was an endorsement of the concept only, the board would still be able to discuss specifics later. Tim Teddy assured the board that they would be able to reserve judgment on any details for a later date. Gartner stated

that in the letter of endorsement to be sent to Council, she would state that the board “looks forward to seeing and discussing specifics.” Timberlake stated that the board should also make sure to get feedback from the SBD.

Walther made a motion to endorse the Connecting Columbia concept. Gerding seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Linda Rootes, North Central Overlay – Rootes stated that the North Central Columbia Neighborhood, while not a business district, feels that they are a part of downtown. Therefore, they would like the kind of benefits and protections that the SBD enjoys. She reminded the board that the Overlay Plan is just that, a plan, and is still in a draft stage. She handed out a map of the different sections of the neighborhood and described what they would like to see for each one. For the Westend, Uptown, and Wyatt’s Market areas, they want more business development. For the Shoe Factory area, they would like to see more employment opportunities. For the North Village, they would like to see construction and the development of residential options. For the Hickman Estates area, they would like it to be a revamped residential area. They do not wish to make any changes to the institutions in the neighborhood. She stated that their plan does not call for an automatic rezoning of any area, and that anyone who would like to do that would still have to go through the same process. She also described a Design Review Board, which would be appointed by the City to consult and give approval of any construction that would take place in North Central. She stated that they would like someone from the SBD to sit on that board.

Wilkerson stated that because the plan is so dense, she feels that the ramifications of the Overlay are hard to understand. Gerding asked what stage exactly the plan is at. Rootes replied that it will go to the City Council as a plan, but will still be revised and the proposed before it becomes an actual ordinance. Ott stated that it is important that the current SBD is protected and not included in this neighborhood. He asked any board members interested in serving on a committee to look into this further to contact him and Gartner.

Old Business

Sign Ordinance Discussion/Approval – Tim Teddy started the discussion by stating that his office will be giving their suggestions to the City Council and he asked if the SBD Board had any concerns. Gerding asked if the purpose of this discussion was to approve any of the suggestions made at the 2/12 meeting. Gartner and Ott asked that any technical comments be sent to Gartner so that she can send them on to Teddy. Ott asked the board if they would like to make any changes to the ordinance. Walther stated that the purpose of the package he proposed was to see if the opposing group would approve of the ordinance with those changes. Danuser stated that he believes the package to be on target with what the board should do. Ott stated that in his opinion, the changing of how an awning sign is measured is valid, but he thinks that the opposing group will never all be happy with the ordinance. He suggested a compromise where upper level retail and restaurants would be allowed a wall sign and an extension sign on the lower level. Gerding asked what the goal of the discussion was. Ott answered that the goal is for the SBD Board to make any changes they see fit. Timberlake stated that he too is in favor of changing the way awning signs are measured, and that upper-level wall signs may just be a sticking point. He believes that the board needs to convey concern for the business and property owners of *The District*. He also noted that even though upper-level wall signs are currently allowed, there are very few up, and suggested allowing them with a limit of 18sf. He also brought up the way signs are measured in general, stating that he believes a more effective way should be implemented. Danuser stated that he too would endorse upper-level wall signs if they were limited to 18sf. Walther stated that the current market shows that upper-level wall signs are not being used, and that in his opinion, if it will garner the support of the opponents, allowing the choice of small upper-level wall signs should be a part of the final compromise to the ordinance. **Vangel made a motion to adopt the suggestions as revised and add them to the final ordinance. The suggestions are: 1. Elimination of percentage caps on awning signs. 2. Businesses with 48 ft or more of lineal frontage in a multi-use building have the option of one 64sf sign instead of two 32sf signs. 3. Upper and lower-level businesses have the additional options of an 18sf wall sign on the 2nd level, a 24sf wall sign on the ground level, or an 8sf projecting sign on the ground level. Danuser seconded the motion.**

Discussion: Paul Land, representing the group who opposes the ordinance, stated that his group, while they would like larger signs allowed for upper-level businesses, will approve the ordinance with these changes. Walther stated that the SBD Board still wants to discourage upper-level wall signs. Gary Kesphol stated that it would be better if the CCA Board was also in favor of this ordinance. Larry Colgin stated that with what he knows of the CCA Board members’ opinions, he can state that the CCA Board would approve the ordinance with these changes.

Ott took a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned because of the time.

New Business

Director's Report

Creative Community Award

CCA Update

Retail Event

Twilight Festival Meetings Planned

Artrageous

True/False

Membership Campaign

City Update

Public Comment

Adjournment

The next meeting is Tuesday, March 13.