

Case #256-21

1 message

CLHA <clha@socket.net>
To: Rusty.Palmer@como.gov

Wed, Sep 8, 2021 at 10:05 AM

We are in opposition to the request by A Civil Group on behalf of Gary Lewis for the approval of the rezoning of 18 parcels on 11 tracts of land in the Corporate Lake Area. Specifically the rezoning of parcels currently zoned M-N to M-C. We don't believe existing Southampton Drive is sized and designed to handle the traffic as it is now let alone if a gas station/convenience store is allowed there as we were told by the Community Development staff. The more intense development possibilities by the denser M-C zoning could also contribute to traffic problems. Currently west bound traffic on Southampton can get backed up to Providence when a car is trying to go south on Executive Drive or school letting out or coming in. It also can back up going east on Southampton as far as John Gary Dr during similar circumstances.

We are also concerned with possible contamination of Cedar Lake from runoff that could increase with more hard surfaces being created due to development without proper stormwater control design. Runoff into Cedar Lake is a major problem with algae blossoms, silt buildup and debris. Since water quality and stormwater management is one priority of the City, proper design and control should be of concern of any rezoning and subsequent development.

Thank you for opportunity to voice our concerns.

Peter Koukola

Pres., Cedar Lake Homeowners Association

Fwd: [External] Rezoning Request

Jay Gebhardt <jay@acivilgroup.com>

Wed, Sep 8, 2021 at 3:01 PM

To: Rusty Palmer <Rusty.Palmer@como.gov>, Pat Zenner <patrick.zenner@como.gov>

Rusty and Pat

This is an email from Randy Gooch. Brian Yearwood, (superintendent) assign my request for comments to Randy Gooch (Chief Operation Officer)

If possible, I would like you to get this email to the commissioners before the hearing.

Thanks for you help with this. If you have questions please let me know.

jay

Jay Gebhardt, PE, PLS

A Civil Group

3401 Broadway Business Park Ct., Suite 105

Columbia, MO 65203

Office - 573-817-5750

Cell - 573-864-9811

Jay@ACivilGroup.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Randall Gooch** <RGooch@cpsk12.org>

Date: Wed, Sep 8, 2021 at 2:44 PM

Subject: Re: [External] Rezoning Request

To: LEWIS <bregaylew@aol.com>

Cc: skip@tigadvisors.com <skip@tigadvisors.com>, Brian Yearwood <BYearwood@cpsk12.org>, jay@acivilgroup.com

<jay@acivilgroup.com>, scotty@corporatelake.com <scotty@corporatelake.com>, cullen@cline-braddock.com

<cullen@cline-braddock.com>, randymacon@reecenichols.com <randymacon@reecenichols.com>,

dlewis562000@yahoo.com <dlewis562000@yahoo.com>

CPS have no issue with this rezoning.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Sep 8, 2021, at 1:34 PM, LEWIS <bregaylew@aol.com> wrote:

>



Rusty Palmer <rusty.palmer@como.gov>

Corporate Lake REzoning - Case #256-21

1 message

Daisy Grossnickle <daisy@tigadvisors.com>
To: "Rusty.palmer@como.gov" <Rusty.palmer@como.gov>

Thu, Sep 9, 2021 at 10:49 AM

Mr. Palmer:

We (the Grossnickle's) support and share the concerns, regarding the proposed rezoning that you received from Mr. Kyle McCurry the General Counsel for CPAC from an email dated September 9, 2021.

Trust that a very thorough study of the traffic density will be studied.

Respectfully, Skip and Daisy Grossnickle

Sent from my iPad

Paige Sports Entertainment
302 Campusview Drive, Suite 108
Columbia, MO 65203

September 9, 2021

VIA EMAIL (Rusty.Palmer@como.gov)

City of Columbia
Attn: Rusty Palmer, Planner
701 East Broadway
Columbia, MO 65205

Re: Corporate Lake Rezoning - Case #256-21

Dear Mr. Palmer:

Reference is made to the rezoning request referenced above. The Columbia Performing Arts Centre (CPAC) is a youth dance studio currently serving approximately 785 youth between the ages of 2 and 18. CPAC is in the Corporate Lake area and contiguous with, or adjacent to, several of the parcels identified in the rezoning request. In my role at Paige Sports Entertainment, I work with and provide services to CPAC. I'm writing this letter to address concerns in this rezoning request that impact CPAC. At the outset, I'd also like to state that we are not opposed to development at Corporate Lake, but urge some revisions to the zoning request.

We have two primary concerns regarding the proposed rezoning: (i) rezoning this substantial block of land, much of which is currently zoned "PD", opens the Corporate Lake area up to a potential sea change in the future without site specific further review and (ii) some of the rezoning requests are not narrowly-tailored to the most likely site appropriate uses, but rather seek to maximize potential site use, which unnecessarily adds additional risk for surrounding stakeholders and the area.

Rezoning of PD Parcels. With the current proposal, it is difficult for any stakeholder to provide meaningful site-specific input or discuss whether the plans are site appropriate because we don't know what is planned for the properties. With many of these parcels currently designated "PD", CPAC and other stakeholders have an opportunity to consider the site-specific impacts of proposed development and advise staff and the commission of those impacts and discuss whether they are site appropriate when those plans are brought forward. The breadth of the rezoning of these 18 acres is substantial in the context of the Corporate Lake area. We urge staff and the commission to consider the breadth of these requests and the wide latitude that will be provided to a future developer and whether that's appropriate for this neighborhood.

Rezoning to M-C, instead of M-N. Some of the rezoning requests do not appear to be narrowly-tailored to the most likely uses for each site, but rather seek to maximize potential use, which unnecessarily adds additional risk for the area and surrounding stakeholders and could permit uses that are not site appropriate. As Staff points out in the report to the commission:

[w]hen comparing the permitted uses of M-N Zoning and M-C Zoning there are a number of obnoxious uses that become available to a user "by-right". These uses vary in intensity from self-service storage facilities and major vehicle service and repair to adult retail and heavy commercial services. Each use has a unique impact as well, including noise pollution, traffic, or general detriment to the neighborhood.

To my knowledge, the current owner does not have site-specific plans for the proposed M-C zoned parcels (except for Tract 11, which could be a convenience store). Given that M-N designation would accomplish the vast majority of the appropriate uses for the M-C-requested sites, we'd encourage the owner and commission to consider a more narrowly tailored designation for Tracts 3, 4 and 11 that would be site appropriate but would have fewer potential negative impacts on the neighborhood.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'KS' followed by a large, stylized flourish that loops back to the left.

Kyle McCurry
C.O.O. & General Counsel