

## Drive-through Survey Opened Ended Comments

Question: Please provide any additional feedback on drive-throughs below.

Comments that are generally supportive of the text amendment, or are not supportive drive-throughs in general
Require accommodations for non-motorists
It has been proven that drive-throughs significantly and negatively impact the walkability of an area and should be avoided at all costs.
My primary concern with drive throughs is the environmental and health impact of autos idling while waiting their turn. If people parked their cars and went in to the business they're patronizing, they'd, of course shut their engines off. We should require that, while waiting in line, they do the same. This would have local health benefits and would conserve fossil fuels and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
I would favor a more general prohibition of idling, but drive throughs are a good place to start.
Dive-throughs encourage driving and increase carbon emissions.
Prohibit headlights from vehicles in drive-through lanes from shining onto residential property that has windows on that side.
The reason for the "no opinion" is that these structures already exist ... however having strangers in cars in a drive through effects the little privacy we have in our homes
Thank you for paying attention and taking care of needs for both residents and business owners.
Your McDonalds example has a street on 2 sides. You are not showing that. I think there needs to be some flexibility in the code. I understand wanting a clear code with no/les variants, but I'm not sure you can make a code that works the same on every property.
I tried to check this option as well but the form won't allow it to be checked: " Currently drive-through lanes and menu boards can be as close as 10 feet to a residential property. The distance should be increased to 50 feet."
Drive thru should have ample space and design to not block roads!
If drive-through service windows are allowed to face residential property, will consideration be given to requiring a buffer, such as plantings or architecturally-appropriate screening? Understand both buffers would require definition with concept examples.
I would also address any landscaping requirements. The photo of all 3 examples could possibly be enhanced by appropriate landscaping or berm placements
Please prohibit AND prevent cars from lining up in residential areas (and from blocking driveways) for the loud noise and other reasons including safety at pick up lanes at all schools. These are similar to drive through.
preserving the flavor of the community is important to maintain our culture, rather than stamping "chain store" looks to neighborhoods.
The use of drive-throughs is already overused. We do not need to give even more flexibility so that we get even more of them. Having hundreds of idling cars waiting for 10-30 minutes for a bag of unhealthy food is not something that we should be encouraging in our community.
The only thing that matters more than all of these questions is that places like Freddy's and Panera in the Conley Rd area are not allowed to have drive-thrus, or even chick-fil-a near stadium. No drive thru lane should have the potential to block traffic.
The architectural design can have a big influence on the curb appeal. That McDonalds is located below street grade and is not quite as obtrusive visually. But if you have a target standard, keeping the more visually appealing side to the primary street is a good plan or designing in a barrier (Culvers) that is visually appealing to block a view that is less attractive.

I love CoMo. I believe the city cares about the residents. Keep on doing good job!
I'm concerned with walkability with so many drive-throughs.
Please try to limit drive thrus in the city and promote a more dense multi-use urban development. More focused on human scale design, promoting walking and cycling.
How can we design these so cars aren't blocking traffic when the line is super long? The Starbucks on Grindstone is a perfect example of a HORRIBLE drive-thru.
I am amazed that, throughout the country, there hasn't been more outrage about drive throughs. Aside from the fact, that they may or may not be aesthetically pleasing, is a much more pressing problem. They reflect our laziness, and they are huge polluters. Regrettably this was not nipped in the buds along time ago. The cat may be out of the bag. If it was up to me I would have absolutely no drive-through's. And it has nothing to do with aesthetics.
I would prefer drive-thrus be restricted even further due to their negative environmental impacts. The light, air and sound pollution they create is detrimental to many species of life in our city, including humans.
should be working to reduce drive ups altogether...health benefits of walking, reduction in single use plastic trash from take outs, reduce air pollution from idling cars.
Drive throughs only help the car driver. Please promote access to all transportation mode users. Consider abandoning minimum parking requirements to allow more walkable/bikeable space around these businesses.
Your survey is mostly car oriented not for all. During the pandemic I worked and rode a bike. I was not allowed to order at drive thrus. Once I was not allowed entry as a pedestrian in the afternoon to a McDonalds as I might rob the place. I am a 70 year old woman who dresses appropriately with no substance abuse problems. What kind of discrimination is allowed in this town.
<b>Comments that are generally not supportive of the proposed text amendment</b>
Drive up windows facing a street are fine. Don't create security hazards by requiring coverings to block the view from the street.
As long as the drive through looks nice, I think they can face the street.
Drive-throughs are of benefit to both consumers and business owners. Rules should be flexible enough to allow them without undue expense. Porticos are expensive and do not benefit anyone, including streetside pedestrians and motorists who are not fooled about the presence of a drive-through lane. It's OK to require more attractive streetside facades on new construction to improve the experience for onlookers and nearby residents. The Culver's building is fine without the portico. The McDonalds would look better with more fenestration. Disallowing the drive-throughs entirely or somehow trying to shield them is the wrong approach. Drive-throughs should be allowed and encouraged on non-street-facing sides of buildings by easing restrictions on site design.
Some of the suggested changes, such as the screening requirement, raise ALARMING SAFETY AND VISIBILITY concerns for the entire community. The non-visibility / concealment of perpetrators (as well as homeless populations) should be SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED by this community.
Allow businesses to have drive thru windows face streets with no screening required.
These regulations are asinine and will prevent good businesses from locating in Columbia. This is a process in search of a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. There needs to be more flexibility in how drive-throughs can be laid out, not less.
Most of the above proposals are totally over the top and just government employees trying to get more power whether it is warranted or not
I think security needs to be addressed. The Culver's example looks like a good spot to rob the place as the robber is hidden behind the wall and out of public view. I think the more public view out in the open the better for the safety of the workers and customers.
See the testimony of the two professional engineers at the September 22, 2022, P&Z meeting and follow what they said. Requiring an expensive transportation impact analysis for ALL drive-throughs is a bad idea. Remove this from the

proposed code. Allow the city staff to use their professional judgement on a case by case basis to require a properly scoped traffic impact study only when really needed.

The Culvers screen wall is a silly waste of resources in this area, screening a service window from a 9-lane major arterial road across the street from another fast food restaurant and one of the biggest parking lots in Columbia. I like police being able to drive by a drive-through window (e.g. ATM, bank teller, fast food place) and be able to see what is happening there.

Code should allow more flexibility for commercial developers while protecting residential use as opposed to residential zoning (e.g. large schools, churches).

Distance from the public street needs to be factored in along with walls, landscaping, grade change in approving drive-throughs.

Don't always look to national standards that don't work in Columbia (e.g. school parking lot size). Allow alternative data from entrepreneur developers who know their businesses best.

Columbia should fix the broken process for allowing more than 200% additional parking while you are making changes to the UDC.

Code should recognize the difference between drive-thru vs. curbside pick-up and regulate accordingly (e.g. less regulation for curb-side pickup)

It should be easier for small developers to understand the various City approval processes and know City staff want to work with them in a spirit of cooperation to make their dreams a reality.

With the City entitlement process, common sense needs to prevail as quickly and inexpensively as practical. Many people in Columbia do NOT believe this is happening now.

---

Quit tinkering

---

If business are impacting residences then change the zoning laws. Business generates tax income. Why burden business with more regulations.

---

More regulation by the city will only stifle new business and cause loss of job creation, and will cause higher food/service prices. No more regulations. De-regulate. Free enterprise is the best solution. Thank you.

---

Can we worry about bigger issues?! Come the fuck on people.

---

To much government overreach

---

City of Columbia has bigger problems than the aesthetics of drive-thrus.

---

This is not the cities business. Rules like this is why businesses don't want to come to Columbia!

---

N/A

---

Quit trying to manage every little detail of a business. I've never seen a drive thru that was offensive!

---

The fact Columbia city government cares about such a meaningless topic when crime is on the rise and friends of mine are being targeted for being of color isn't surprising but should be. How about we start caring about people

---

Although I understand the concept behind what is being proposed, we have seen how mobile ordering, drive-throughs, etc. have become more popular with people (especially in regard to the current state of affairs in the world). Personally, it's not that I feel the Culver's example is "bad" per say, nor that it isn't accomplishing what the city might be going for, but I do believe there is an inherent safety risk when you are situated in a spot where you are basically cut off from view of your surroundings.

Also, it's important that we remember the City of Columbia only has so much "commercial space" available for development and due to many other stringent zoning requirements, the proposed changes seem to be pushing away any "grab and go" options given site plans, etc. In a way, this feels as though you are working to truly eliminate (or make it incredibly difficult to have) drive-throughs. As the mom of a toddler (and I imagine many others with little ones in carseats would agree), drive-through's are a necessity! Taking a child (much less more than one) of a carseat is time-consuming, often frustrating for both the child and parent, and in times of extreme weather, possibly detrimental (remember the whole kiddos can't wear coats in car seats thing).

We need businesses to come to Columbia. We need them to thrive. We need them to be able to operate their businesses in a way that makes the most sense for them and for their chosen site. The extent of requirements that already exist (not just around drive-throughs) have worked to make many businesses the community asks for all the

time that have looked at Columbia as a place to grow, turn around and walk away. Adding requirements to something as necessary (in my opinion given motherhood and all) as drive-throughs is ill-sighted and will only serve to frustrate business owners and larger companies that many would love to have expand into this area.

This is stupid for us to be discussing. Who cares.

This survey is an example of government overreach. If a property is zoned as commercial, the property owner should be able to locate the business in any orientation it so desires. If it abuts residential property, the owner of the abutting property should oppose the zoning as commercial. Beyond that, the city should stay out of the issue. The city is again micromanaging the private and commercial affairs of property owners. Further, the options included in the questions are inadequate and loaded to predetermine an outcome supporting government overreach. I selected no opinion because the options fail to encompass the full spectrum of view points.

You all are just a bunch of Nazi's trying to take away private property rights. Quit it.

Please deal with more pertinent issues effecting our City...panhandling on our streets!

Don't see the point. Parked cars or cars in a drive through are the same to me.

This survey does not give me a chance to disagree with the proposed changes, nor does it explain them to the average citizen to be able to fully understand the implications of the changes. I believe that the changes that have been suggested will cause unnecessary expenses and solve problems that are not present at the moment. They also create places for criminals to hide.

This ordinance cannot provide a one size fits all solution so why try?

This is another example of the city overstepping to hurt businesses.

We want more businesses to have interest in spending their money in Columbia

I feel the city should focus more on more important topics like homeless, public transit, pedestrian traffic, etc not the aesthetics of business.

a business can figure out what is best for them without big brother micro-managing

When you cover drive thru lanes it makes it less safe for the customer using the lane and the person working. We do not want these covered. It also is more expensive for the business owner and does nothing for business.

This survey is completely misleading. The whole point of the survey was to give examples of drive-thru's around residential neighborhoods but the three examples that are provided are all located off Stadium Boulevard of which are not around any neighborhoods, thus leading the feedback from this survey to not be accurately represented. I think the city should go back to the development code that was put in place in 2017.

In my opinion this survey is not a fair representation of the proposed ordinance and the results of the survey will likely be quite misleading and easily misconstrued.

\*\* For example -- Not wanting a drive through visible from my residence does NOT correlate to not allowing drive through lanes adjacent to street frontages.

\*\* There are significant differences between high traffic volume drive-throughs (generally fast food) and lower volume (pharmacies, ATM's, Banks, dry cleaners, etc) and they should not be treated the same. High volume fast food buildings derive 70-100% of their revenue from drive-through traffic and delivery services with a much smaller percentage being from dine in traffic. While there may be exceptions, there are few problems with traffic conflicts between drive through lanes and required parking. Low volume drive throughs have even less conflict.

\*\* The photos in the survey of what looks nice .vs. not nice are very subjective and the answer options could be quite misrepresentative. For example - I like the look of the Culvers drive through, but I do NOT think that this should be required. There are a number of examples of drive throughs in the community on street frontages that are attractive (again being subjective) without the use of Porte Cochere's, roof to ground screening, and additional landscaping.

\*\* The last question in the survey requires accepting a condition that I do not support OR selecting No Opinion. Yes, I have an opinion - I do not agree with the suggestions.

\*\* Porte Cochere's, full screening, etal. for drive throughs adjacent to street frontages in commercial areas is NOT a Neighborhood Protection issue. It should not be necessary to screen drive throughs in commercial areas. NOTE: Designating the level of street as a criteria will not be effective either as there are several examples of drive throughs (especially on corner lots) being adjacent to local minor streets.

\*\* Additional provisions for drive-throughs adjacent to R-1 and R-2 uses may be appropriate as a Neighborhood Protection issue and should be addressed separate from drive-throughs adjacent in commercial areas.

**Comments that include both supportive and not supportive responses, or are not specific**

I would rather see a drive thru window face a street than to ever face a residential area. If the drive thru ever faced a house or duplex that would be so annoying to residents. The smell of car exhaust and engines running. Now if a drive thru faced the solid or blank wall ( meaning without doors or windows) of apartment building then it might be slightly less annoying. Apartment buildings usually only have windows and doors on one side. It seems like City wants to accommodate the ever increasing fast food restaurants and drive thru coffee shops. We have an insane amount of fast food already

Honestly, the thing that would make Columbia look better in this aspect is the visual of the building in its style/design. Where a drive thru faces isn't as big of a deal to me, but driving by a nice new neighborhood or a new development with an old outdated establishment is what throws me off. Not seeing the windows would be nice...but also the Panera near RBHS, all you see are the cars from all roads since the window faces planet fitness. I'd rather see the order board and 1 car and have the cars wrapped the other way. From providence and from Nifong, you only see cars/no pretty building.

We have bigger, more pressing needs in this City than to worry about whether cars in a drive-thru can be seen from a street.

I agree that there should be a buffer in residential areas, but the "hiding" of a drive-thru like you required at Culver's drives up construction costs and is absurd.

I think Chick Fil A should open a second location with drive through. How about near Broadway & 63?

We need less complicated regulations. People know how to walk to a building. We do not need to require a painted walkway. It does nothing to increase safety and just adds constant expense to keep it painted.

Chick-fil-a is the problem that should be considered in future designs. If you park in a space and it's rush at lunch time, good luck getting out. The line will block you in for a long time.

The McDonald's by the mall has a drive thru that faces the street and it looks fine. To prohibit that would likely mean that business closes and leaves. We want to encourage development any way possible as it provides jobs, taxes, etc.

Businesses already in service should be grandfathered in and not have to change.

For the question about the culver's building, the design looks nice and works well with the wall covering the drive through window. I think that design should obviously be allowed but I don't necessarily agree that a cover for the drive through should be required.

I would be MORE supportive of this one if it were like 25 or 30 feet, 50 is going to wipe out a few too many lots/options: "Currently drive-through lanes and menu boards can be as close as 10 feet to a residential property. The distance should be increased to 50 feet."