

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
June 6, 2024

Case Number 130-2024

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Springbrook Crossing, LLC (owners) for approval of a design adjustment seeking relief from the provisions of Appendix A, Section A.5 - Curves of the UDC. If approved, the design adjustment would allow the internal street network to have tighter curves than outlined in the design standards for a road classified as a neighborhood collector. The subject street is named Ledger Drive as shown on the preliminary plat of Springbrook Crossing North (Case Number 59-2024) that was reviewed and recommended for approval at the Planning Commission's May 9, 2024 meeting.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested design adjustment from Appendix A, Section A.5 - Curves in regards to Ledger Drive, shown on the preliminary plat of Springbrook Crossing North.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open -- oh. Sorry. Go ahead, Commissioner Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: My questions actually relate more broadly to the development, which I understand was -- to the plat, which was discussed at a prior meeting, but I -- for context, I'd just like to understand. This road connects up to State Farm Parkway and on the other side -- if you could go to the slide with the larger panoramic view of the site. There you go.

MR. KUNZ: That one?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. So my concern is I'm wondering about what thought went into when Veterans United does their holiday lights, and there is a substantial amount of traffic that comes down that road and it's basically turned into a parking lot. And where that -- I think is it Crosby is the road that -- it's going to be -- it's going to come out the opposite of Veterans United? What discussion, if any, may have been had about how this neighborhood is going to be impacted in the context of that, or how that neighborhood being there is going to impact the traffic flow and how that's set up for entrance into Veterans United during that season?

MR. KUNZ: Yeah. I'm not -- I'm not sure if I'm answering your question correctly, but tell me if I'm not. There was a development agreement that is associated with the preliminary plat which features

some road improvements, one of which notably would be a second lane added to a roundabout at the -- that would align with what will be -- or has been identified as Crackley Drive on the preliminary plat. Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. It's the middle drive for Veterans United is where the roundabout would be, and there would be a second lane added to that. That was identified by the transportation -- or the traffic impact studies that were provided to us by the applicant. Yeah. That was a requisite improvement. There was also -- it's two points of ingress and egress splitting between Lots 2 and 3 and 4 and 5 on Veterans United and State Farm Parkway, respectively. So I believe they're addressing, or they have addressed concerns about potential congestion through the development agreement.

MR. ZENNER: And if I may add, Mr. Williams, the development that is mainly to the west of the VU campus, which is referred to as Springbrook, so the traffic improvements, there's two separate traffic studies here. There are two separate development plans that are being constructed by the same developer. The parcel that is to the west of the VU campus has obligations associated with South Providence Road, as well as with Veterans United Drive. The roundabout is intended to be installed at the existing entry to the medical complex, and that roundabout has not yet been constructed. It is in design at this point, and that is, in essence, to the east of the double-barrel access that is the current main entry into the campus. So -- and that is referred to in the traffic study for Springbrook as VU Middle Drive, and the MU Hospital Campus Drive. So that is a -- that was evaluated. That traffic study and those requirements of the traffic analysis for Springbrook became a basis for our traffic engineer requiring a traffic study for the property that we are dealing with that is known as Springbrook Crossing North, and it has its own separate traffic study that had requirements associated with it as Mr. Kunz has indicated. It had identified an additional westbound bypass lane around the future roundabout that will be constructed, which is required to be a single-lane roundabout. It requires separation between Crackley Drive and the eastern entry to the parking lot of VU, so it will have a restricted -- there will be a restriction at that point to where the only turning movements allowed at Crackley and the eastern entry to VU will be right-hand movements. You will not be able to make a left-hand turn, and that is part of the development agreement specifically associated with Springbrook Crossing North, and then the other two three-quarter turn pocket improvements along -- one along Veterans United to lots one and -- two and three, and then another one that would be on State Farm Parkway to four and five. There have been addendums provided by the applicant to the traffic studies as it relates to the development that is proposed on Lot 10 of the preliminary plat right now, that have provided sufficient justification to our City's traffic engineer that the roundabout that is part of the obligations of Springbrook does not need to be installed before Lot 10 could be platted with the existing development and then that also includes development impacts that are being created by the Thompson Autism Center which is being built by the University of Missouri, which is an exempt entity from compliance with the City's requirements of development. So that traffic, while we are aware of it, and we are aware that there are a number of implications associated with the medical traffic, as well as other traffic that flows in this corridor, all of those are taken into account as it relates to our traffic study standards. The particular activity that is annual at VU with their lights, you can't develop a

street network plan to address something that's of that nature, but we have taken the steps necessary and as required and specified by the Code to ensure that long-term regular daily traffic is being addressed. The occasional inconvenience of high volumes of traffic at seasonal times is just something that as a community we have to deal with, and VU utilizes private services, if I'm not incorrect, for traffic coordination, as well as approaches the City as necessary to help mitigate that. The development to the north actually may provide some additional relief when fully constructed for staging for circulation purposes. We just don't know. And then the roundabout that is yet to be installed may also assist in that as a way of being able to help distribute traffic more effectively than it is today. Hence, the reason why we use a lot of roundabouts instead of traffic signals. It helps to keep traffic flowing. I'm not sure if that -- our combined answer gave you the answer you wanted, but that's the reality of what's going on down here.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think it -- thank you. I think it answered -- at least in general, it answered my question. It sounds like, to a certain degree, it's a little -- there will be some adjustments with the roundabout at Crackley Drive, but it's still somewhat to be determined how that -- the Veterans United lights will -- may be impacted, or this neighborhood may be impacted, you could say it both ways, when those two things converge for several weeks every year.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I would point out that what we are being asked tonight is the angle of the curves here. And, I mean, I appreciate the discussion and certainly traffic flow is going to be problematic at least during that month, I think, that they run the lights. But the question isn't is there going to be a road connecting State Farm Parkway to Veterans United through these two lots or however many lots. The question is how steep will those curves be. And frankly, and we can get more into it when we get to the discussion part, but just reminding all of our Commissioners, like, there's going to be a road here that developers are going to build. The question is what is it going to look like? Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward. Name and address for the record, and you know all the things.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I believe Mr. Kunz did a good -- good job in his staff report for -- for this project, and I appreciate him putting in, included in that staff report, the definitions of and the various types of roads, because when this project started, I believe that really we believed that there were going to be local non-residential, and I believe the staff did, to some degree, as well, believed that this area was going to be filled with local non-residential streets and not necessarily neighborhood collectors. If you look again, he briefly mentioned it, but the across the University property to our west, and you can kind of see from this depiction here, it's the yellow lines that kind of traverse the area just north of the M-OF designation, all of those roads are designed with the same neighborhood -- or, excuse me -- with the same local non-residential standard. And so I believe what the idea there was is that's what these roads

are going to be -- be constructed as. That was our belief, that was our thought, and, again, it makes -- you know, it makes more sense that -- that they get built that way with a tighter curve. Again, we're not going to decrease the amount of traffic. We're not going to decrease the volumes that those roads can handle, and it does slow them down through the commercial areas. And -- excuse me -- in this case, the office areas. And then also it's not going to take away any of the other modes of transportation. We still have sidewalks on both sides, just like a neighborhood collector, The width of the road, depending upon -- I mean, it used to be the fact that we had a neighborhood collector -- or we had collectors, we had arterials, and we had residential and local non-residential, and each one of them had one street width and one classification. Now we have a varying and wider range of different options for all these different street standards. So basically what we're talking about here is the road width is going to be basically the same, maybe actually a little wider than that of a neighborhood collector depending upon what option you go with on the neighborhood collector standard. So really the road is going to be basically the same, just a little tighter curve. And so, again, those -- those curves are nowhere near the minimum that you would have for, like, a residential neighborhood. They're still wide angles much larger than that, more than twice that requirement. So it's not an unsafe situation by any means. And so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have, but do concur with Mr. Kunz' staff report.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any other member of the public that would like to speak on this case? Seeing none. We will close the public hearing and go to Commissioner comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any Commissioner who wishes to comment on this case? Go ahead, Commissioner Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: I recognize that this -- that the plot, the overall development is already considered by my colleagues and before I was part of the Commissioner and so I say these comments with respect to them, and the fact that I wasn't here to hear all the information that -- that was presented. I do have concerns -- I don't have concerns with the road. I understand the issue -- the current issue with respect to the curvature and I don't have any concerns with the curvature of the road. My concern is more broadly. When I think about Columbia as a whole, I look at where the space is and I'm not sure that this is the best use of space here. I don't have concerns with these kind of developments, I'm just not sure that this particular location for a development like this is the right place. Moreover, I do have some concerns about how it might impact both -- how the holiday lights, it's an important part of -- these kind of events are an important of community, and I think that having the neighborhood here could have an impact on that in terms of -- there's going to have to be an effort to try to make sure that people can get in and out of that neighborhood, that emergency personnel can get in and out of that neighborhood if necessary. And the way the traffic has -- flows now, it's really just every bit of that road, it becomes a

parking lot to push people towards the lights. And I have a little bit of concern if we shut down a lane on State Farm Parkway so people can get into the neighborhood, it's going to push more traffic out onto to Grindstone, or what happens if people need to come in, they usually shut Veterans United Parkway down heading -- so you can't head east on Veterans United Parkway, you can only exit that way. So if someone has come to the neighborhood east, well that -- that road is going to be blocked. So I do have some concerns about how the traffic is going to work for people who live there or if there's emergency needs or -- again, if space is made available to accommodate that, how that's going to affect the traffic flow into the surrounding streets, because Grindstone does get backed up particularly on peak nights as a result of the event, as well. So those are my comments. I just say them for the record, for future consideration, and thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any other Commissioner comments? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I would like to entertain a motion, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You need to do it into the microphone.

MR. STANTON: As it relates --

MR. CRAIG: If you're wrapping it up, I think Commissioner Placier had a comment that you -- missed out on you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, thank you very much.

MR. STANTON: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier, go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't see you.

MS. PLACIER: It wasn't that necessary, but I was just going to point out that the lights are an issue for a small part of the year and also at night. And so I'm not sure that the traffic through this particular development is going to crash into that that much. And -- and with the curves, anything we can do to slow the traffic is good, so that people aren't going to try to use that as a shortcut of some kind or a pass through and speeding through there. I think the curves will actually have a good effect on that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Anyone else to make comments that I may have missed? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I don't usually do this. It's against what I like to do, but I'm going to go on record of making just a comment of my thoughts, and I tend to agree with Commissioner Thomas [sic], because I enjoy the lights, so I go, and it is horrible. And traffic does get backed up on Grindstone and traffic is only allowed to go one way, and it is terrible. And even though it's one time of year, it's about, like, ten days for one time of year. So if you're in that neighborhood, it's -- it's going to be problematic.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Stanton, I think we're ready for you.

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, can I entertain a motion at this time?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 130-2024, Springbrook Crossing North design adjustment -- curves, I move to approve the design adjustment providing relief from Appendix A, Section A.5 --

Curves from maximum degree of centerline curvature.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do we have --

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion for approval was made by Commissioner Stanton and seconded by Commissioner Loe. Is there discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Ford, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Mr. Baysinger, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier.

Motion carries 9-0.

MS. CARROLL: We have nine votes to approve; the motion is carried.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That motion -- or that recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.