

February 24, 2016

City of Columbia
Community Development
Attn: Clinton Smith, Planner
P.O. Box 6015
Columbia, MO 65205

Re: Planning and Zoning Case #15-199 - Proposed Self-Storage Text Amendment

Dear Mr. Smith:

Thank you for meeting with my client Dan Burks, his surveyor Gene Basinger and myself today regarding the work done to date related to the request we made last August for a text amendment change to the zoning ordinance regarding removal of the height limitation for self-storage facilities in the C-3 zoning district. We appreciate the effort that staff and the commission has put into researching this issue. It was also good today to spend the time to more fully understand the proposed change and how it differs from our original request.

As we discussed in today's meeting, we have some concerns about the proposed language and how it might affect future construction of self-storage facilities. Ideally, most developers of such facilities would like to avoid the time and expense of utilizing a conditional use process that, while more flexible, can become quite subjective. We would like to see a bit more flexibility and consideration given under the proposed design standards for those building "as of right". We also have some points of clarification to request though this may or may not need language changes:

- (6)a. - Does property not being adjacent to residential include across right-of-way?
- (6)b. - Prefabricated metal panels come in all sorts of styles and qualities. We don't believe that they should unilaterally be excluded from the permitted building materials. And does this include roofing materials? Would the Commission consider modifying this to allow no more than a certain percentage of the vertical surfaces of a building to be prefabricated metal panels? We would propose 50%. Many of the other options become quite cost prohibitive on multi-story buildings due to the structural load. We have no issue with not allowing ugly corrugated metal, but there are many more attractive options that from a distance look as good or better than the types of facades you are willing to allow.
- (6)c. - Would neutral earth tones still allow for your basic red brick?
- (6)d. - This additional screening requirement doesn't appear to address an existing site (redevelopment). Within the current landscaping/screening ordinance, there is some provisions for redevelopments to not require existing pavement to be taken out in order to meet the code, etc. Also, because the setbacks in C-3 are so small, if a site has multiple

Page 2

frontages, the area needed for the trees could really inhibit the amount of land available for construction that wouldn't otherwise be needed for setbacks.

We would like staff and the Commission to consider further research to these issues and modifications to the proposed language to address these concerns. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Christina Luebbert".

Christina L. Luebbert, P.E., CFM, LEED AP
Owner/Principal Engineer