

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
MAY 23, 2019

Case No. 117-2019

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of Show-Me Central & Missouri Habitat for Humanity (owner) for a preliminary plat to be known as "Boone Prairie". The 50.28-acre site is zoned R-1 (One-family Dwelling) and IG (Industrial). The proposed development would contain 143 single-family residential lots and 13 common lots used for water quality on the R-1 zoned portion of the property, and one lot presently improved with a cell tower on the IG zoned portion of the property. The site is generally located to the southeast of the intersection of U.S. Highway 63 and Brown Station Road.

MS. LOE: May we have a staff report, please, Ms. Bacon.

Staff report was given by Ms. Rachel Bacon of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for Boone Prairie.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Bacon. Before we move to Commissioner questions of staff, I would like any Commissioner who has had any ex parte prior to this meeting related to Case 117-2019 to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Ms. Chair, I'm just being very cautious. I'm involved with the Land Trust and would may have something to do with this in the future. So just to play it safe, I probably will recuse myself from this to just be safe.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. Anybody else? Seeing -- oh. Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I had a discussion with some friends regarding a previous development by Habitat that some of the comments that were made would probably apply to this development also. I believe that I can hear the evidence and make a judgment on what's before us without being prejudiced by those comments.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Anybody else? All right.

MS. RUSHING: I'm checking with our attorney to see if he disagreed with me.

MS. LOE: He has given you full approval to remain. Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: I have a question for staff. Are we at that point?

MS. LOE: I -- yes. Yes. All disclosure of ex parte is completed. It's questions for staff. Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: Can you go back to your second slide. I think one of them might have said Arbor Pointe. Maybe not. Maybe I missed something.

MS. BACON: Yes. This this -- yes. I apologize. I didn't change the heading.

MR. TOOHEY: Okay. Just making sure. Does that matter at all?

MR. ZENNER: The slide show was provided only for the purposes of information.

MR. TOOHEY: All right. Just making sure.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff?

MS. RUSHING: All of the detention-retention areas, are they tied into a storm sewer system or are they free-standing? Do you -- do you see what I'm getting at?

MS. LOE: Crockett may be able to answer that question.

MR. ZENNER: Crockett Engineering is here, and I think that would be a question better asked and answered by -- by Crockett's office itself.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. TOOHEY: I've got one more question. Just looking at the -- at the plat, I was under the assumption with the UDO that this would have required three entrances and not two. Am I wrong in that?

MR. ZENNER: Anything that is over 30 lots requires a secondary point of access. I don't believe -- and that access -- so the two points of access actually are coming to a collector or an arterial roadway, and I believe that is one of the conditions or criteria that's within it. So if this was a standard residential street and it had this number of lots, I believe -- and I haven't slept with the ordinance enough to know the detail, but I believe, if I recall correctly, it refers to collector and arterial streets. So if your accesses come out to one of them, the necessity for a third entry point when you get to this level of lots is waived because it is deemed that the road capacity of the connecting streets, the two points of access will allow for the distribution of the traffic. Within the development, we do have a requirement as it relates to street segment loading and, as Ms. Bacon pointed out, the street segments themselves was verified and was found compliant with the Code itself. So, again, I can defer to Crockett's office to answer that question in greater detail if you would like, but based on our staff analysis, which goes through a lot of internal analysis, not just by our staff, it was not found to be noncompliant.

MS. BACON: I will say we spent a lot of time on this because of the curvilinear nature of the development is a little bit different than what we normally see, so we spent quite a bit of time doing our analysis with the Public Works Department.

MR. TOOHEY: Okay. I just wanted to make sure. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? I see none. We will open up the floor to public comment. If there's anyone that would like to come forward and address the Commission on this case, we would welcome that information. If you can please give us your name and address for the record.

MR. GREENE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Andy Greene with Crockett Engineering at 1000 West Nifong Boulevard, Building 1, Columbia, Missouri, 65203. I'm here representing the applicant, and I would see before you a pretty straightforward request, all zoned R-1, so staff report was pretty

thorough. To answer your question about the storm water, so the -- the pocket water quality lots basically in the backyards, they're all tied to storm sewer, so they're all going to eventually make their way down to the detention basin on the north side -- basically, City storm water manual on design, so I'll be happy to answer any questions anybody has.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for Mr. Greene? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I'm back on the -- I'm still on those detention basins.

MR. GREENE: Okay.

MS. RUSHING: The plan indicated that the homeowners association would maintain those.

What about access? You know, each basin is in the backyard of multiple homes.

MR. GREENE: Yeah. It's basically in their backyard. So in previous versions of the Code, they would have been required to have stem lots to access those, actually fronting on the street right-of-way. But the UDC, if I'm correct, is what changed, basically. It's got an access easement that follows the lot line, a common lot line between two neighboring lots, and they're -- they're actually shown on here, but --

MS. RUSHING: Is that what those darker --

MR. GREENE: Those are the pocket bioretention cells. It's basically a place holder. But the actual access easement, just for an example, I'm looking at Lot 24 and 25 on the top of the page, basically, on the east side of the property. So between that, it's -- there's a dash line that shows an access easement, and that's typical for the other lots.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. GREENE: So it's -- it's not public right-of-way, but it is allowed by an easement for public, I guess, City maintenance, if they had to, to get back there to maintain those should the owner not maintain them themselves.

MS. RUSHING: And is it anticipated these would be planted or unplanted in, say, a rain garden or --

MR. GREENE: Yeah. Bioretention is typically the most common water-quality feature that we design. They give you the most bang for the buck as far as quantity and quality and ease of construction and maintenance, as well as providing good drainage. So one thing to consider with all these in these backyards, bioretentions are favorable to get, basically, storm water out of there as opposed to a rain garden, which is more marshy, if you will, and kind of allows water to pond there for more -- more amounts of time. But bioretentions have a larger overflow, and so they're better at draining, which is better for the backyards.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for Mr. Greene? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Greene. If you have any comments, please come up to the podium. And please give us your name and address for the record.

MS. JEFFERSON: My name is Barbara Jefferson, and my address is 305 North Fifth Street. So on this project, you're going to bring -- am I hearing that you're just going to have a way to get in from the back -- a driveway from the back; is that correct or not? I mean, I'm just trying to get it clarified.

MR. ZENNER: The road frontage for the project is on Brown Station Road. And so there -- the primary road that goes in front of the project, Brown Station, as you are probably aware, there's two entrance points.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: Here and here. There -- the rail line is on the backside of the property here, so there is no access from Route B. And then this is Highway 63, if I'm not incorrect, here on the northeast side of the property. And, again, there is no access from there, either. So all of the access is back out onto the existing City public street at the two entry points. The street, as Ms. Bacon pointed out, does require some additional road right-of-way to be dedicated, should the City decide at some point in the future to widen that roadway to a larger number of travel lanes. But what is being proposed here is traditionally the way that subdivision development is proposed to be accessed and is compliant with the Code.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. I was just wondering. I'm just thinking about the traffic -- traffic and all that pretty natural route, truthfully, especially with the emergency situations and things like that.

MR. GREENE: Thank you.

MS. JEFFERSON: And the question about drainage.

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MS. JEFFERSON: You know, that -- that -- has -- how would that be done again? Would you like to -- would they be able to have their own drainage area? How would that work?

MR. ZENNER: You all need to come up to the microphone, please.

MR. GREENE: (Inaudible)

MR. ZENNER: To the Commission, please.

MS. JEFFERSON: They really don't want -- I believe he's answered my question. Okay.

MS. LOE: Mr. Greene, if you can give us your name and address again.

MR. GREENE: Andy Greene with Crockett Engineering at 1000 West Nifong Boulevard, Building 1, here in Columbia, 65203. So in a residential subdivision like this, you're required to basically treat for the water quality component of storm sewer. And so, basically, in these backyards, there are these bioretention cells, is what's typically installed, and they basically filter the water, if you will. And then that -- that's -- it's basically a requirement of the City as far as development and storm-water management.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. I'm just -- so, okay. I'm just thinking, you know, because we really have been getting some heavy rain a lot, so these little things are going to take care of these -- this area?

MR. GREENE: Yeah. That's correct. So a typical storm-sewer system, and you're required to have up to the 100-year rainfall event. It's supposed to be designed, and so there will be adequate ways for the water to get out of here and not flood homes, basically, when significant storm systems come through.

MS. JEFFERSON: Okay.

MS. LOE: Mr. Greene, those retention cells are tied to the City system --

MR. GREENE: Right.

MS. LOE: -- which it goes back to Ms. Rushing's question.

MR. GREENE: Right.

MS. LOE: So those systems are tying into the City storm-water system, so the water isn't just collected there, but the water is directed there from the backyards and then taken away?

MS. JEFFERSON: Well, if there's been a lot of flooding going on and there's concern, and I think about the older part of Columbia, you know, and the way the water will run.

MS. LOE: Can you speak into the microphone?

MS. JEFFERSON: Oh. When I think about the older part of Columbia, and we're already having problems, but you're talking about this is already going to be into a drainage system already that should not be affecting other areas of Columbia. It's going to be adequate enough to take care of things like that.

MR. STRODTMAN: Correct. And I'll just add a little bit. You know, this is -- this is managed to prevent that. And what -- what happened in the older part of Columbia is we did not have the rules that we have in place today. And so we've learned from the past, and what the City has done with storm water for the last few years is addressing all of the past problems or, you know, making sure that we don't repeat the past and keep continuing to develop homes that flood the basements or have problems when it has large amounts of rain. So I think we've done a really good job the last number of years on addressing to make sure storm water is not a problem like it has been in the older parts of Columbia.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. DOKKIN: Dee Dokkin, 804 Again Street, and I just have a statement. If climate realities are going to force density into my traditional single-family central city neighborhoods by denying downzoning requests, that same reasoning should apply to all neighborhoods, even this very worthy project. I think it's time to consider eliminating R-1. I know you don't have the power to do that tonight and in general, but it's -- it's just an equity issue, plus it makes sense for density to be everywhere in the City.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Dokkin. Are there any questions for Ms. Dokkin? I'm -- have some downzoning requests been denied?

MR. ZENNER: Not that I'm aware of, ma'am.

MS. DOKKIN: No. There was just talk of it.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. DOKKIN: And I expect that -- (inaudible).

MS. LOE: Are there any additional public comments? Seeing none, I'm going to close the public comment period.

MR. ZENNER: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: If I may, I want to follow up on Mr. Toohey's question. I have slept long enough to know that the old Code had the provisions I was referring to where we had a threshold of multiple entry points with a waiver if you were -- for a third entry point if you were along a collector or an arterial. The current UDC actually specifies a maximum number of lots off of a single -- a maximum number of lots off of a single entry to be no greater than 30, and I think I -- I understand part of what the concern or question was. There's 143 lots here. Roughly, there should be, if you used the 30 lots, four points of entry. That is not -- it doesn't empirically equate that way. The fire service, as well as our -- our traffic engineering staff evaluates how do the lots -- how many options do the lots have within the development to be able to get out. So with the curvilinear street network and with the intersecting streets that come in, no greater than 30 lots off of a single road segment have less than one point of access to be able to get in or out of the development out of the two primary entry points. If we had something that was created where we would have created a cul-de-sac, for example, that would have had only a single point of entry to those lots, and that was over 30, we would have required the cul-de-sac to be shortened to lessen those total number of lots. In this, the overall circular road pattern actually helps to eliminate from a fire and a traffic circulation perspective the necessity to build more entry points into the development than what are shown on the plan. So, again, I go back to my initial statement. We reviewed it, we do find it to be in compliance with the access standard, and it does not necessarily -- it's not a one-for-one application where for every 30 lots, you expect to see an entry point into the project. Unique to this is that there are no abilities to stub to the northeast or directly to the east due -- or to the south, for that matter, due to the existing development that is around this project site. If there were opportunities to do that, we'd have stub streets being shown, which would then allow for future connectivity and other entry points. Just wanted to provide that clarity.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: Can I ask Mr. Greene another question? Do you mind coming back up?

MS. LOE: I'm going to reopen the public hearing.

MR. TOOHEY: So, now, since the density had to get brought up, I was wondering about that as I was looking at this, and I talked myself out of asking the question because of who the applicant -- oh, my knowledge of how they develop these subdivisions. So did you guys think about doing any increased density in any of this at all or is that not capable based upon how the applicant will develop this area? Is that not feasible to have this type of affordable housing, I guess, was my question.

MR. GREENE: Andy Greene. Once again, I don't know if I've got to say that. Unfortunately, Tim Crockett might be the best to answer that question. I was not too involved with the initial discussions as far as density, number of lots, arrangement of sorts with the -- our client. Unless -- I do have a representative from Habitat for Humanity here if he wants to comment on that, but I'm sorry, I can't --

MR. TOOHEY: I mean, if you want to. I'm just -- just a curiosity, so -- since density is becoming an issue, so --

MR. CALDERA: Madam Chair?

MS. LOE: Yes.

MR. CALDERA: Just to make sure that everybody is aware, now that the public hearing has been opened back up and the applicant was given an opportunity to speak, we should open -- allow anyone else who wants to give additional comments also.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Caldera. Are there any additional public comments? Any comments about the density of the project? I see none. I'm going to close public hearing. Return to Commission discussion. Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I'm going to make a motion. In the case of 117-2019, Boone Prairie Preliminary Plat, I move to approve the preliminary plat for Boone Prairie.

MR. STRODTMAN: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Strodman. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, may we have a roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Strodman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder. Recused: Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 7-0, with Mr. Stanton being recused.

MS. BURNS: Seven to zero, motion carries.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. That closes our subdivision and takes us to public comments.