

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
JUNE 22, 2017

V) SUBDIVISION REQUESTS

MR STRODTMAN: Thank everyone for their patience for that. We will just go ahead and get started with our subdivision requests. At this time, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to Case 17-100, please disclose that now, so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case in front of us. I see none.

Case # 17-100

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent) on behalf of THD-REB Properties, LLC (owner) for approval of a 59-lot preliminary plat revision on R-1 (On-family Dwelling District) zoned property, to be known as "The Vineyards, Preliminary Plat #3". The 24.1-acre subject site is two separate parcels, one located on the south side of Elk Park Drive, approximately 150 feet east of Berkley Drive, and the other on the south side of State Highway WW, approximately 800 feet west of Stone Mountain Parkway.

MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the revised preliminary plat for The Vineyards, Preliminary Plat #3.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Commissioners, any questions for staff?

Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Planner Smith, I noticed this is moderate to steep slopes, pretty heavily wooded right now. Can you talk to me just a little bit about storm water on this?

MR. SMITH: I could say that it meets the current storm water ordinance 12A with the --

MR. MACMANN: So everything is going to stay --

MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. Say that again?

MR. MACMANN: Go -- please go -- I -- I interrupted you. I'm sorry. Please --

MR. SMITH: That's fine. They -- they have been reviewed to meet current ordinance standards for storm water. I couldn't speak necessarily to the specifics of the design of that system. This is a revised preliminary, so we don't have final construction plans at this time.

MR. MACMANN: I -- I just want to a -- a standing concern of mine.

MR. SMITH: Sure.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you very much.

MR. SMITH: No problem.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional questions? Yes, Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Ballentine Lane -- if you go back to the plan. Just -- where does that connect through on the north end or -- yes.

MR. SMITH: I apologize. Where's Ballentine Lane?

MS. LOE: On the east.

MR. SMITH: On the east. Of this side?

MS. LOE: Correct.

MR. TEDDY: Northeast.

MR. SMITH: Here. So this portion does connect into the undeveloped -- or underdeveloped portion of the property to the west. This is not owned by the current developer. It's kind of an island in the middle of the vineyard. So they are required -- or staff did recommend and require that they stub that to account for future development of the site. So there is street connectivity.

MS. LOE: So the expectation is that Elk Park Drive will connect through?

MR. SMITH: Correct. Yes, that is the plan.

MS. LOE: And if that doesn't happen?

MR. SMITH: If it redevelops, it should happen. If it never redevelops, then this is what we will have.

MS. LOE: And what we have as presented meets code requirements?

MR. SMITH: Correct.

MS. LOE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Good question. Same one I had. Mr. Smith, the last -- last question I have. The -- the cul-de-sac in the bottom left-hand corner -- the southwest corner?

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: You mentioned that it's -- it -- not planned for development today, but it would be for future; is that -- am I getting that correctly?

MR. SMITH: The large Lot 52 to the west?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. Right. Yes.

MR. SMITH: So in its current form, Lot 52 is shown on the preliminary plat, so they could plat that as one large lot. What's more likely to happen is that the PD portion of that will develop in the future with a single-family residential development. At that stage, then they would have to come back to the P and Z for that development plan.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Any additional questions? I see none. As is in past practice, it is not a public hearing. But if there is -- if there's folks in the crowd that would like to give us relevant information to this, we would ask that you come forward, give us your name and address.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett. Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I believe Mr. Smith did a -- did a very thorough job with the staff report

illustrating this revised preliminary plat. Again, this is the third preliminary plat for these parcels. I was involved at the very first preliminary plat that happened many years ago. At that time -- it was the intent of this developer at that time to reserve this area for different uses. The area on the -- on the east side, he thought maybe a church, maybe as a light commercial, something along those lines. And the area on the west, maybe a PUD or multi-family, something along that -- in that nature. Since that time, the property has changed hands a few times, and I think that the intent and the desire of the developers have changed. The current property owner is under contract with my client -- my client is to purchase basically what you see here -- not all of the property that goes to the west, but basically what you see here. And it's his desire to build single-family residential. I think it fits in very well. It's -- it fulfills the obligation and the intent of the current owner when they re-preliminary -- re-preliminary to the property to re-subdivide it for further development. Talk about a couple comments. Mr. MacMann, you talked about the storm water. Yes, we fully intend to comply with the storm water regulations for the City of Columbia. We can do that on the property. It's been reviewed by the engineers and they are fully confident that we can fulfill those obligations. With regard to Ballentine Drive, Ms. Loe, we've -- we've asked the City engineers on multiple -- multiple occasions, as well as MoDOT, to see if we could have an access. That would be a great point to have an access -- another point of access for that development. However, given the location on WW with relation to the curve and other access points, they've said that's not going to be appropriate. Furthermore, we have access to Elk Park Drive, which is existing. It's in place, and we will have a direct access going up through Elk Park that will be access to a future signalized intersection. We think that's important. It gives all the folks in -- you know, the 100 lots that are in the existing portion of the Vineyards that's on the north side of the creek, it gives them a secondary ingress and egress -- and more importantly, at a signalized intersection. As so we think that's important. And so with that, we believe it's a -- a fairly straightforward request from that point on, and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions for this speaker?

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: I see none. Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Any additional speakers in the audience that would like to come forward?

MR. EGGEMEYER: Hi. My name is Jim Eggemeyer; I'm at 2008 Bates Creek Drive. And I just left a HOA meeting just to come to this meeting to ask a couple questions. And we're not aga-- I'm not against progress and I only represent the HOA in that I am a member. Is -- is that -- on the right-hand side of the Ballentine Street, I was really concerned about the size of the lots in comparison to the size of the lots that are in the other part of the -- the Vineyards Subdivision. Some of those are even, like, 50-some feet in width and they're maybe 150 in length. It's very hard to build a nice aesthetically pleasing house on such a skinny lot. So that was my first concern. And the other -- second concern was that that road does end at a dead end on a person's -- near a person's farm who -- it's probably in the grand scheme of things to eventually zone that also. But to be honest, I -- they may resist that. I'm not

sure. And if -- that's all -- basically all I had to say, so.

MR. STRODTMAN: Well, I'll try to give you a -- a little clarification -- and, staff, feel free. My assumption is, is all the lots are legal, conforming lot sizes. So by code and by the City's definition of a legal lot, those would meet -- that size that you referenced would meet that definition and would be a legal size. And then it would be up to the engineer and the architects and the applicant to design homes that would fit on that size of a lot, though they may be different size than what you see, you know, in existing. But they're still a legal conforming lot. And then, I -- I forget the second -- I had to -- I --

MS. LOE: The dead end.

MR. STRODTMAN: The dead end. Interesting that you brought that up, because I -- we -- we had the same question. I -- I think we -- you know, we had a clarification of staff as to why that is. And, you know, it -- it's easy to understand that the applicant doesn't own the piece in the middle and so they can't connect. But from the City's standpoint, as Mr. Smith had, I think, referenced, if it is redeveloped, more than likely the next owner -- again, it's just more -- you know, it's just -- there's no guarantee. It would be redeveloped into a higher use, which should be the R-1 -- the similar use that we're seeing on both sides, and it would be connected. And at that time, the infrastructure's there. It -- it's much more affordable. They don't have to go back and get ownership -- you know, land from the neighbors next door to continue the road. They're not going to have to move a house. They're not going to have a dead end in a situation that they -- we wish we could have fixed. But at the same time, that dead end could sit there for 100-plus years and always be a dead end -- that those neighbors that are at that end need to understand it may always be a dead end or someday it may be a through street. But today, it's a dead end and I'm assuming it would be built in such a way where it -- they can't get into the -- the A-1 lot, the middle lot, you know, so it -- that they're not turning around in a field or something. But --

MR. EGGEMEYER: Could I ask one more thing?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes.

MR. EGGEMEYER: On a previous rendition of the right-hand corner, there was a -- was a cul-de-sac that came off of there that offered maybe a few more lots of a decent size, compared to the current rendition that was shown that -- it had -- had a cul-de-sac that came out halfway up the new addition -- a new road there, onto the right. Yeah, right there.

MR. SMITH: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: Predominately -- and I'll just speak for staff. Predominately, the City frowns upon cul-de-sacs. Even though as a resident and a citizen that lives on a cul-de-sac, I love my cul-de-sac. But from a -- fire trucks, trash trucks, ambulances, all other services, they don't -- we don't like cul-de-sacs. So from a planning standpoint connectivity, everybody's connected, everybody can flow. You're not segregating everybody -- you know, everybody can work through the neighborhoods and the communities -- walkable, et cetera, is very important. So this is thinking forward with the dead ends, but there is no guarantee that it will ever happen. But if it does happen, we fought -- it is as forward as we can to try to think that through, but there's no guarantee.

MR. EGGEMEYER: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: It would -- you would think it would make it more favorable for the owner to do that, but that owner doesn't have to.

MR. EGGEMEYER: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: There's no requirement. Any additional questions for this speaker? Thank you, sir.

MR. EGGEMEYER: Thank you.

MS. RIGGERT: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Beth Riggert; I live at 1605 Ballentine Lane, which is three lots south of the red line. I attended the March 28th Public Information Meeting that Mr. Smith provided information, as well as Mr. Crockett's associate, Mr. Green. This is not the proposal that was shown to us at that time. As the previous speaker noted, the right-hand corner had a different configuration, and the left side was dramatically different. It did not have either the cul-de-sac or the stubby road that also terminates at a privately owned farm. This is also the first time that I think any of us in the Vineyards have heard any proposal of any residential development going north -- or going on the north side of what will be the City park. And it appears that now the plan might be to try and connect the Vineyards to El Chaparral, and that is not something that I -- I think anyone in the Vineyards has heard before. So I guess that's my comment. And my question is, because I realize this is not on the public hearing portion of the agenda, so I don't -- I guess I'm asking what opportunity might there be for residents to be heard before a -- a proposal is finally adopted by the City P and Z?

MR. STRODTMAN: So --

MS. RIGGERT: If this is not the appropriate time, my apologies.

MR. STRODTMAN: Staff, would you -- Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: All I can tell you, as you stated earlier, this isn't a public hearing for plats. Plats typically do not have public hearings associated with them. They are typically reviewed for consistency with the subdivision regulations, and if they are generally consistent with that, then they are generally approved. So the portion to the west that I think you are referring to is a little different. It is zoned P-D, which is a Planned District. So any development there would be required to come to the Planning and Zoning Commission, and there would be a public hearing. And there would be notice sent out to the property owners of that public hearing. This portion here was a revised preliminary plat, and we sent out notice for a Public Information Meeting, and that's generally to make residents aware that there is a preliminary plat occurring. But as -- again, as we noted, it is not a public hearing, although we do receive public input on these plans. So there is a distinction there between the hearing and the plat, and that is very specific, and there's a reason for that. So that's the reason you might receive notice for the piece to the west. For this piece, the only notice that is received by residents within 200 feet is for the PI meeting. So there is no other venue until this goes to Council. You are welcome to go to Council also and speak, but this -- this generally would be the best venue if you did have input on that specific plat.

MS. RIGGERT: Well, as I noted earlier, I appreciate that. Thank you. Because I think we are

not as aware of the process as obviously you are all. The sentiments expressed this evening at our HOA meeting, which several of us just left early so that we could be sure to be here before this meeting occurred was that we would like an opportunity to talk to the developer as future development progresses so that -- because we believe as residents of the Vineyards that we share an interest with any future developer that the neighborhood be something that is really nice and high quality, and we're -- we do have a concern that the lots are making it difficult for similar homes -- homes similar to the ones that currently exist to be built. I've had -- I've spoken to a builder who said that he has -- has been struggling to come up with a design. He said one of his more recent homes was a 65-foot wide home, and that would be wider than some of the lots that are proposed on both sides of this. So we're a little bit concerned about that. We, as neighbors -- and I can't say that we're speaking on behalf of the entire HOA or the Vineyards Association because we didn't take a vote, we just wanted to come here and speak -- would welcome an opportunity to talk with Mr. Crockett, staff and with the developers about any future plans in whatever manner might be appropriate.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, ma'am. As staff mentioned, there will be -- you know, if there's future development on that PD area, then there would be future discussion --

MS. RIGGERT: I mean, but to this too.

MR. STRODTMAN: As well as City -- if we decide to push it -- move it on to City Council, then there obviously will be opportunity there for you also, as well as anybody else from your HOA.

MS. RIGGERT: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you for coming this evening, ma'am.

MS. RIGGERT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Anyone else like to come forward? I see none. Commissioners, additional discussion?

MR. TOOHEY: I've got a question for Mr. Crockett. So in -- in looking at the size of the lots, the size of these lots actually do seem consistent with what's already been developed out there.

MR. CROCKETT: They are.

MR. TOOHEY: Am I missing something?

MR. CROCKETT: They are very consistent with what -- with the other lots that are in that area. You can kind of see the dashed portions there within -- relatively the same size there. I mean, they may be a little smaller in some areas, but they're -- you know, they may not be as deep, but we have green space behind a lot of our lots. A lot of the lots are even deeper. The reference to the lots on Ballentine --

MR. STRODTMAN: Is -- was there a question, Mr. --

MR. TOOHEY: Yeah. I was just curious if it was consistent because when you look at some of the stuff that has already been developed out there, there's already other -- a few of the lots that are actually smaller --

MR. STRODTMAN: Right.

MR. TOOHEY: -- then --

MR. CROCKETT: I think the lots here are fairly consistent with the existing lots in the subdivisions. Yes.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional discussion? A motion for consideration?
Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 17-100, Vineyards Preliminary Plat No. 3, revised preliminary plat, I move to approve.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: We have a motion from Mr. Stanton for approval of Case 17-100, with a second from Mr. MacMann. Commissioners, do we have additional discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Planning and Zoning's recommendation for approval of the revised preliminary plat for Vineyards, Preliminary Plat No. 3 will be forwarded to City Council for their consideration.