

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**DECEMBER 8, 2016**

**Case No. 17-8**

**A request by Crockett Engineering (applicant) on behalf of Ridgemont Development LLC (owner) for approval of a 28-lot preliminary plat to be known as "Ridgemont Park". The subject 12.73-acre property is located on the south side of Ridgemont Drive west of College Park Drive.**

MR. STRODTMAN: May we have a staff report, please.

MR. ZENNER: If I may, Mr. Chairman, have one moment. I would just like to also make some opening remarks as it relates to this particular case for both the Commissioner's understanding, which I believe you are aware, as well as those that are in the public here this evening. This is a subdivision action. This is not a rezoning request. It is not a discussion of land use. This land use has been determined on this property previously. It is R-1 zoned property. There was a former planned district proposal presented on this tract of land, but that is not the topic of discussion this evening. We are discussing a preliminary plat, which is the -- a first stage in the ability to subdivide the property as it is legally zoned. The review has been undertaken in accordance to the subdivision regulations and Mr. -- Mr. Palmer will be able to give you a report as it relates to the content of that review. We do have representatives from City's traffic engineering department that have been apprised of the traffic related matters associated with this project. They are here to comment on their comments that were incorporated into the plan, and we have also received additional information from the City's assistant director of utilities as it relates to utility information, which has been another expressed concern with this project, and Mr. Palmer will be able to respond to that as well on their behalf. I believe we have a letter which should have been distributed to the Commissioners as it relates to the utility issues associated with this property. With those opening comments, I'm going to turn the meeting over now to Mr. Palmer for him to be able to give the report. He is the staff member that has worked on this project, both the PUD that is not being discussed and then this subdivision case, itself. Thank you very much.

Staff report by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for "Ridgemont Park", with the added condition of traffic-calming measures to be constructed by the applicant as prescribed by the City Traffic Division.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, questions for staff? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Both the earlier plans -- well, the first plan, the Madison, I believe, plat showed -- okay. So it's the west -- so Madison Park --

MR. PALMER: Yeah. This is Madison Park Plat 2.

MS. LOE: And the Westwood was the first one?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Westwood Hills.

MS. LOE: All right. So this one indicates that there was a connection at Chapel Hill?

MR. PALMER: Yes. There is a north-south connection to Chapel Hill and -- between Chapel Hill and Ridgemont, which is an extension of College Park.

MS. LOE: Correct.

MR. ZENNER: Which has subsequently, Ms. Loe, been vacated --

MS. LOE: I under--

MR. ZENNER: -- by both Madison Park Plat 1 and Plat 2, so --

MS. LOE: I understand that, but the staff report identifies that that vacation was supported because of the single-use nature of the proposed purpose of the Madison Plat. The Ridgefield Park proposal does not appear to be that same single-use purpose, so I'm wondering what has happened to the right-of-way and the connection to Chapel Hill.

MR. ZENNER: And that was where I was going.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: The right-of-way -- the right-of-way for College Park from Ridgemont to Chapel Hill has subsequently been vacated. The eastern half of the southerly portion of what is the Madison Park property, which includes Madison Park proper to the subdivision development to the south that is accessible off of Chapel Hill was Plat 1. Plat 2 is what is the subject site. At the time that the subject site was proposed for platting as a single lot for conveyance to then the Lutheran Church, concurrently with that platting request was a request to vacate the eastern half of the College Park right-of-way as it existed from Chapel Hill, all the way down basically to Ridgemont. So the entire eastern portion of the right-of-way was vacated. We have subsequently platted or replatted property on -- on Chapel Hill Drive -- I have to get all my streets right here -- Chapel Hill, that is where Provision Living is located today -- the assisted living just above Twin Lakes Park, and vacated the western half of the southerly portion of this street. The -- the northern portion of College Park and its western half has never been vacated. It still exists as a platted unbuilt unopened public street. Concurrently, at the time that Madison Park Plat 2 was platted --

MS. LOE: Can I just ask Mr. Palmer to maybe go back to the larger scale map showing -- thank you. So maybe we can just look at --

MR. PALMER: Do you want the other one or --

MR. ZENNER: So --

MS. LOE: -- some of these?

MR. ZENNER: No. That -- no.

MS. LOE: Been better -- or you choose.

MR. ZENNER: I think this is the better one --

MR. PALMER: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: -- because this shows the addition I'm just explaining. I've got two mics here. It's difficult to point. So you'll note that this is Madison Park Plat 1. This is Madison Park Plat 2, which is highlighted -- the subject site. The eastern half of the original College Park right-of-way that ran north-south has been vacated in whole. The western portion of this right-of-way, which is here, and this is the

Provision Living site -- totally different Rock Valley Plat 4, if I recall correctly, vacated everything to its northern property line. So all of College Park now is gone on the north -- south end of this -- of its former right-of-way platted back in the early to mid-60's. The western half of College Park is not gone today. At the time that Madison Park Plat 2 was platted, realizing that there was a single use proposed that a public street would not have run through, it was the conclusion at that time of the staff back in 2005 and in coordination with Public Works at that point that a permanent terminus be provided via separate right-of-way documents. So this cul-de-sac that you see here is actually not per a recorded plat for Madison Park Plat 2, it is per separate -- per separate dedication, not an uncommon practice back in the mid-2000s. We would typically -- if today that were to occur, we would require the cul-de-sac to have been platted; however, they took it as a right-of-way. Ostensibly at that point in 2005, the City, had the church developed, would have accepted a single dead-end street. However, as Mr. Palmer pointed out in the entrance to his report, the subdivision regulations are clear that they support the continuation of streets when you have adjacent developments that are similar in nature; hence, we have two single-family subdivisions abutting each other, which would consistent -- would be considered consistent, and therefore the extension of a public street is appropriate in accordance with the development regulations as they exist today. Had we not vacated the eastern half of College Park, and I would -- on this particular tract of land, it is very likely that we would not have been looking at a cul-de-sac street or a connection at this point. We may have wanted the connection, but we would have also potentially been looking at a north-south connection back out to Ridgely in-between these two tracts of land based on the fact that there was a public right-of-way there that was never opened or built. And that would have been triggered by the development proposal at this point. So because we have vacated half of a right-of-way, we're not going to require them to dedicate that. That ship, we believe, has sailed. And the connection basically of Ridgely's dead end to Ridgemont is a more appropriate platting activity at this point for the continuity of the existing street system, not to basically require the yellow line and then potentially a connection here if we had not vacated the other half of the right-of-way to create basically a T intersection instead of what would now be a through movement and eliminating the cul-de-sac. A cul-de-sac, in reality, because it is not on a plat doesn't need to be vacated; we just basically do not utilize the right-of-way dedication that we received. We have no reason for it.

MS. LOE: So just to clarify, there is no connections between Ridgemont and Chapel Hill planned for -- provided for at this time?

MR. ZENNER: No. Based on the determination back in the 2005 staff report in the minutes of the Planning Commission, the topography associated with being able to make that connection which was part of the justification for eliminating that right-of-way is such that it would never have been able to have been made economically.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Yes. Thank you. When Madison Park 2 was platted back in the 60s, the city

population was about 36,000. I just -- I just looked that up because I'm pondering growth over time. If you could -- you had talked about two traffic calming elements, one at Ridgemont and Woodhill and one at Ridgefield and Woodhill; is that correct?

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Are either -- am I correct in assuming that there is no traffic calming to the east of the Woodhill and Ridgefield intersection in the current plan?

MR. PALMER: No, there is not.

MR. MACMANN: Am I correct in assuming that there is no traffic calming currently planned within Madison Park 2 as we developed as R-1?

MR. PALMER: No, there is not.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Let me -- and I -- this may be for the traffic engineers. I'm travelling eastbound on Ridgemont, why on earth do I go north? Why don't I just drive through this new subdivision?

MR. PALMER: Do you mean Ridgefield?

MR. MACMANN: I'm travelling -- correct. I'm travelling east on Ridgefield, and what is my motive to turn north?

MR. PALMER: You have to turn north to get out of there, so you either drive north on Woodhill or you --

MR. MACMANN: Well, once the --

MR. PALMER: -- drive north on --

MR. MACMANN: -- has gone in and I have this connector?

MR. PALMER: They're the same -- they're essentially two of the same options, you --

MR. MACMANN: I --

MR. PALMER: And that's why this plan was done --

MR. MACMANN: I appreciate that.

MR. PALMER: -- to --

MR. MACMANN: I'm just saying that --

MR. PALMER: -- illustrate --

MR. MACMANN: I would submit that with all due deference to our traffic engineer, most of that traffic is going to go into that subdivision.

MR. ZENNER: And I would believe from a logical perspective, Mr. MacMann, you are correct. Outbound traffic from the development will likely not have an incentive to make a left-hand turning movement to head north. Inbound traffic, however, that is coming from Stadium to Chapel Hill may not see making the additional turn appropriate or convenient, and therefore would proceed north, or in this instance, west on Ridgemont to Woodhill, Woodhill to Ridgefield. I think to your point, you're asking if there are internal traffic-calming requirements within the development that may be a greater dissuader for through traffic.

MR. MACMANN: Yes.

MR. ZENNER: That is as pointed out in the staff report, and our traffic engineers can address that, there is an option that was offered should the Commission and Council not deem the speed tables as a reasonable exercise of a condition that traffic calming internal to the development may be appropriate. Again, that becomes an issue that we'll let our traffic engineer speak to if you want to further explore why potentially both options may not be appropriate. And I believe the applicant will have probably comment to that effect as to why both may not be a reasonable expectation of their 25-lot development as well.

MR. PALMER: Another thing I would like to point out too, and really the reason I made this plan is that the bulk of traffic at the moment is along the segment of Ridgemont between those two stop signs there and basically the Woodhill and College Park, so if you were to drive through heading eastward on Ridgefield, you stop at the stop sign at Ridgemont and you wait for all that traffic. That's what would potentially dissuade people from driving through that neighborhood and down the current dead-end street.

MR. MACMANN: I will submit my experience driving in that neighborhood is different, but --

MR. PALMER: I mean, if you stop and wait for traffic for 20 minutes, you're less likely to -- to go through the neighborhood. I'm just --

MR. MACMANN: All right. We've -- we've certainly provided more illumination on that issue. I have no questions -- more questions at this juncture.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional? I assume the reason for the Ridgefield Road extension -- proposed extension not connecting to College directly was due to the creek proximity?

MR. PALMER: Partially because of the creek. There is an existing trail there also. And then the initial public comment didn't want it directly connected to College Park because of the connection issues, so it was moved. Really, that's about the only place it can be outside of -- well, outside of tearing up the creek and the trail to get to College Park.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Anything additional, Commissioners? With that, we'll go ahead and if there is anybody in the audience that has some relevant information that we have not already heard, we would appreciate that. And also, just please give us your name and address at the beginning, and we'll go from there.

#### **PUBLIC INPUT OPENED**

MR. STRODTMAN: So we will open for any public input. Again, not a public hearing.

MR. CROCKETT: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. With me tonight is Caleb Colbert, and he is at Brown Willbrand representing the applicant, which is John Jones of Pate Jones Construction. I believe staff did a very good job of the overview and the staff report for this project, so I'll try to -- with my comments be brief, knowing that the meeting is going to run long tonight. A lot of the information I have is repetition of what they have already presented. Again, it's roughly -- it's 25 residential lots on 20 -- on 12.24 acres, with a

density of roughly two units per acre. It's not uncommon for residential developments to be at that density level. It is relatively low for single-family residential. Again, all utilities are either on or adjacent to the property and the development is in full conformance, it does not stretch or expand on the public infrastructure on the outlying limits, which is such a common issue anymore. There's some plan highlights I want to go over, open space, storm water management, trail network and site configuration. Again, I want to talk about open space a little bit. Again, 12.34 acres, and again, I think there was a couple references to 12.24. It is actually 12.34. Total area of this acreage being left in common space or green space is 7.1 or 58 percent of the entire development is going to be in common space, either donated to the City or in green space for the development itself. Again, approximately 5.8 acres of the site will be deeded to the Parks and Recreation for the expansion of -- or for the trail area. Storm water management, this is always a concern. It has always popped up. Again, full compliance with City regulations, both on water quality as well as detention. I know this area has had some concerns with storm water in the past, but we can address those concerns within the regulations of the City of Columbia without much of a problem. Trail network, the City staff touched briefly on that. The City's County House Trail runs directly through the property. A substantial portion of that trail runs through this property. The development will connect to that existing trail at least at one location, and most of the area surrounding the trail will be deeded to the City. We think that is an important factor. What is highlighted in green is the piece of property that we want to dedicate to the City. Now, we've talked with the Parks and Recreation Department about that, and they're -- they are very excited about the opportunity to be able to obtain this piece of property given the fact that they have such a large portion of their trail that runs through this property. It's not coming to the City with any cost. It is simply a donation because of the constraints on that piece of property, we feel that is necessary. What is illustrated in yellow is the internal green space within the development. That will be owned by the HOA that will have our storm water facilities located on those areas to comply with the regulation. So those will be owned and maintained by the -- by the HOA, but will certainly be green space for the development. Site configuration, and Ms. Loe, you kind of talked on this a little bit. Site configuration, you've seen this layout and you've seen the street network that is out in the location right now. This slide, while not as fancy as the City's, kind of illustrates the former north-south connection from Ridgemont down to Chapel Hill to the south. And as indicated by staff, over time portions of that right-of-way have been vacated. The main purpose or the main reason for the vacation was basically for the southern portion, as Mr. Zenner had indicated, became not economically feasible to construct that portion of the roadway. So when the church had the property to the subject tract, the church had it coming through the City -- or coming to the City with a single use, meaning they wanted to put a church facility or a school facility, a single use on a single piece of property. The City knew about that, so what they asked for -- they knew at that time that Ridgefield was not going to be extended as originally contemplated. When I say "originally contemplated", originally contemplated by the 1966 plat that created that portion of Ridgefield. So the City knew that the -- a single use of that piece of property would not extend Ridgefield, so what they did is they asked the developer for an

easement. It has been referred to as a right-of-way, but I believe it is a street easement so that at some point in the future if it was developed as a single use, the City would have the right and the ability to come in here and construct a cul-de-sac to permanently end Ridgefield because it never was permanently ended. It was basically, you know, not conforming to City regulations. And so here is the original plat. Again, Mr. Palmer showed that, and you can kind of see the original intent was to come out of Ridgefield and extend north and south, but have a connection back out to Ridgmont. This is what our proposal is doing. We are providing another location back out to Ridgmont. So we're -- while the original intended use was to have that extend to -- that extension to Ridgmont, when the property was sold to the school, they decided, hey, we're not going to do that. So the thought was, well, if you're not going to do that, then we'll have to terminate Ridgefield. Well, now we're coming back full circle. We're back to the situation where we're asking to develop the property in conformance with the R-1 standards for a single-family development, and with that being said, we've been asked to extend that street to go back to the full conformance of the 1966 plat. And so while it is not in the same location, it's still -- still conforms to that original intent of having Ridgefield have a connection, have a tie-in. Here's a few comments that the City staff has made. It says that this connection is consistent with Section 25-42 (2)c of the Subdivision Regulations, which suggest that interconnection of adjacent subdivisions with compatible land uses shall be encouraged. That's exactly what we are doing with this plat. They have also stated that the extension of the roadway appears to be consistent with the original platting actions that created the neighborhood adjacent to the subject site. And again, that is what we're doing. And lastly, this connection will provide opportunities for better neighborhood circulation and delivery of public services. Again, that is what the proposal is doing. So while we have had previous submittals to the City with regards to PUD developments with private streets, this is a public street. We are trying to perform and complete a preliminary plat that is in full conformance with the Subdivision Regulations. And I believe that is what is before you here tonight. Again, in conclusion, they've already gone through those items -- the park, the density, the area of green space, and of course, the staff recommendation for approval with conditions. So with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Crockett?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes?

MS. LOE: In the staff presentation, the traffic calming measures --

MR. CROCKETT: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: -- shown are outside of the development.

MR. CROCKETT: That is correct.

MS. LOE: Did you consider any traffic calming measures within the proposed development?

MR. CROCKETT: The staff has also proposed -- instead of outside of the development, they've also proposed that instead of putting them outside, we may put them inside. So, you know, if -- if the Commission desires to put them in -- not to put them outside the development --

MS. LOE: But the same --

MR. CROCKETT: -- the Commission can make the recommendation.

MS. LOE: -- the -- still speed tables?

MR. CROCKETT: There are different --

MS. LOE: Did you consider anything else?

MR. CROCKETT: They're -- well, they're different in nature. They perform the same function, but they're not at an intersection necessarily. But they are within the street. We've done those before at other locations. The City has standard details for that that could be implemented here.

MS. LOE: But you didn't consider bump-outs or bulb-outs or design measures?

MR. CROCKETT: We've -- we've considered those. You know, we're not proposing them, let's put it that way.

MS. LOE: All right.

MR. CROCKETT: But we'll be -- you know, we'd be open to discussion with regard to that.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MR. KRAUS: Good evening, I'm Earl Kraus, 2304 Ridgefield Road. And I would like to cede my time to Kim here, if that is okay. All right. Thank you.

MS. KRAUS: Thank you. And thank you, Commission, for allowing me to speak. My name is Kim Kraus. I live at 2304 Ridgefield Road. I'm here on behalf of many neighbors, as well as members of the Ridgefield Park Association for which I serve as President. I will make references to the agenda report already discussed by Rusty Palmer -- written by Rusty Palmer and dated December 8th. We oppose the extension of Ridgefield Road. Traffic and safety concerns already discussed are paramount to our opposition to this development as proposed. The proposed connection of Ridgefield Road at Ridgemont is less than 1,000 feet from Stadium Boulevard with driveways even closer. Ridgefield Road, in conjunction with Ridgemont Road serve as cut-through for drivers already because the streets provide access between Stadium, Fairview, Forum, Chapel Hill and Rollins further west via Hulen. There are two hard turns and two stop signs. The connection of Ridgefield Road, however, would be a new straight shot no-stop route. We have almost no sidewalks in our area and no bike lanes. We are less than one mile from Fairview and Russell Boulevard Elementary Schools, Fairview Park, Kiwanis Park, and the County House Branch Trail runs through our -- winds through our area. For over 10 years, we have documented traffic and safety problems. Ridgefield and Ridgemont are on the traffic calming list, but are still at just number 11 and number 12. In March of this year, using data from Public Works, the Columbia Missourian did a full page story on our plight, and I say "plight" because although it was a City-wide review, 29 percent of the top listed problem streets are the one I'm talking about -- 29 percent -- Ridgefield, Ridgemont, High Ridge, College Park and Rollins. Making Ridgefield Road a direct



connection from Stadium to Fairview would draw traffic, not divide the existing traffic. It would draw additional traffic off Stadium. Stadium Boulevard is classified by CATSO, Columbia's long-range transportation plan, as an expressway. Fairview is classified as a major collector. The report states that our traffic problems would exist regardless of whether the road is connected. This comment is dismissive and ignores the future implications of a straight-shot no-stop connection between Stadium and Fairview. Even the 2040 -- the year 2040 CATSO Plan does not show a connection through our residential area. The connection of Ridgefield-College Park to Stadium has never been studied, so neither have the repercussions. There are 18 intersections on Stadium Boulevard between Interstate 70 and Highway 63. All but one of the intersecting streets are also expressways, major arterials or major collectors or they serve limited areas of commercial use or high density housing or the roads don't go anywhere, meaning they serve a closed-off area. The only intersecting street that does go somewhere is Rollins Road, which is such a hilly and twisty road; there is no driver that would choose that as their go to. The report says the proposed development will result in additional roadway impacts, recognizing the future implications, and recommends the developer pay for two off-site speed tables, one each on Ridgemont and Ridgefield, with both streets being over a mile long making one speed table on each road far inadequate. Although the Vision Zero policy created by the mayor's task force on pedestrian safety has not been adopted, it bears mentioning here tonight because it may be soon and as a strong advocate on our behalf, as are the guiding principles from the Columbia Imagined Plan. Given the dangerous situation long identified and still unaddressed in our area, an unplanned for and unstudied extension of Ridgefield Road is unfathomable and would be negligent. Other reasons paramount to oppose connecting Ridgefield Road, City ordinances restrict it, and there is nothing that requires it. The Madison Park 2 Final Plat dated October 18th, 2005 notes record a vacation of the College Park right-of-way. Ordinance 25-20.1 states that restrictions set forth in notes on a plat may be eliminated only by ordinance or a resubdivision and shall not be eliminated unless Council determines such elimination may not be detrimental to any land in a subdivision or to any neighboring property. The report states a connection of Ridgefield to Ridgemont was originally intended, and this is absolutely false, and plats back to 1966 confirm this. College Park Drive to Chapel Hill was the planned route, as we have discussed tonight. The report states that since a connection of Ridgemont to Chapel Hill has been eliminated, it is now appropriate to connect Ridgefield Road instead. The City itself approved the request over the years to vacate portions of Chapel Hill -- or, excuse me -- of the College Park right-of-way. So my question is by whom and under what authority is the decision now to substitute Ridgefield Road instead for a connection granted? The report states a permanent dead end at Ridgefield was never installed. The report states this is somehow the fault of the neighborhood and therefore can be used against us in this matter is baseless. And as previously stated, the Ridgefield Road dead end was platted as a permanent turnaround in 2005 -- in the 2005 final plat. It has never been platted as a temporary turnaround. The 1966 plat has a temporary turn-around, which perhaps the report's authors saw, but it was at the west end of Ridgefield, not even adjoining this parcel. The report says another reason to extend Ridgefield Road is Ordinance 25-42, which requires

interconnection. This isn't correct. It was right on page 1, however, when it said the ordinance suggests it. The ordinance actually says only that it is encouraged. Encourage does not mean require. The report then says that the developer hasn't asked for a variance on this ordinance so staff isn't considering alternatives, but if the extension of the road isn't required then there is no variance to ask for. While the traffic division desires connectivity where possible, City ordinances do not require it, and, in fact, our neighborhood's connectivity ratio is even lower, meaning better than the CATSO stated goal. Ordinance 25-30 supports disapproval of the connection. It states a resubdivision shall be required to change and approve a recorded final plat if such change affects any street layout thereon. It goes on to say a resubdivision of land shall not be approved by Council if the Council determines that the replat would eliminate restrictions on an existing plat upon which neighboring property owners or the City have relied or the replat would be detrimental to the property and the detriment outweighs the benefits.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Kraus?

MS. KRAUS: Both of these are true.

MR. STRODTMAN: Your time is up.

MS. KRAUS: Okay. One more minute.

MR. STRODTMAN: I'm sorry. Your time is up.

MR. KRAUS: I ceded my time.

MS. KRAUS: He ceded my time, so don't I have 10 minutes?

MR. STRODTMAN: No. You have -- it's not a public hearing.

MR. KRAUS: Well, I asked if that was okay. Did I cede my time to her? Well, then I would like to have used my time.

MS. KRAUS: All right.

MR. KRAUS: Where did you leave off?

MR. STRODTMAN: Are there any questions for Ms. Kraus?

MR. KRAUS: She has her conclusion statement is all.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. KRAUS: In conclusion --

MR. STRODTMAN: Please state your name and address, please.

MR. KRAUS: Again, my name is Earl Kraus, 2304 Ridgefield Road.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir.

MR. KRAUS: In conclusion, please leave Ridgefield Road a dead end. That's what it has been platted as. The property owners have relied on that. They've purchased their houses based on this. The ordinance itself says -- it is not referred to in the report that if doing this is to the detriment of those property owners then the City is restricted in taking this action. That's not talked about. We're talking about roadside calming -- or road calming that is proposed outside of the plan. The developers themselves have said in writing to the City that they will not pay for that, so I don't know how that's going to fix the problem. I'll stop there. Thank you for your time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Kraus.

MR. KRAUS: All right.

MR NIES: Good evening. I'll be very brief. My name is John Nies; I live at 1414 Overhill Road. And you can see where it is on the map here. And I'm just here to speak up for my road -- my little section there of Overhill because we -- whatever happens to Ridgefield absolutely affects our road. In fact, it already does. The gentleman over here was speaking about most of the traffic going through Ridgefield and then turning north on Woodhill, so I'm going to introduce you to my road. Between Ridgefield and Ridgemont there is a section of Overhill, and if you include the intersection of Ridgemont and Overhill, there is 10 homes there, all but three have children. Most of them have two children and most of them are younger than five. And we experience the same traffic issues that Ridgefield and Woodhill do. For instance, right now there is a stop sign at -- excuse me -- Woodhill and Ridgefield, and drivers have figured out that they can go left to go north on Overhill and continue all the way through to College Park without having to stop because there is no stop sign at Overhill and Ridgemont. We also have the same kind of street structure as Ridgefield does where there is no sidewalks. There is lots of foot traffic, lots of bike traffic. And so I'm not here to speak on the extension; I'm only here to speak to our street because the gentlemen over here were saying that most of the traffic goes this one direction, and if there are traffic calming projects put in place, we believe that Overhill should also have some consideration with that because if you do put traffic calming on these other routes that have been proposed, then drivers will figure out they can go along Overhill, which continues to be a dangerous section of road for our families. So I wanted to come here just to speak up for our section of road, knowing -- making sure you all knew because there's other studies have been done, yet nobody has mentioned our street. I've talked to our Council person about it; I've talked to our community representatives, yet somehow it is not coming up in this conversation, so I felt like someone needed to come and stand up for our street, Overhill Road. And that's really all I have to say.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, is there any questions for this speaker? Mr. Nies, I have a question. Did you have any solutions for traffic control currently, regardless of the proposed --

MR. NIES: Well, I have been thinking about it. It seems so -- when you come down Ridgefield from Middlebush, it's all downhill. You know, it's a very hilly neighborhood. And when you come down to Ridgefield and Overhill drivers are just flipping around the corner there and then speeding up because they have to go up Overhill --

MR. STRODTMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. NIES: -- and so, you know, I'm not an expert in traffic calming by any means, but I thought a stop sign would make sense. And a stop sign even at Overhill and Ridgemont at first -- you know, the people on our street talked about speed bumps. I'm not even aware what speed tables are. I'm showing my ignorance here. But it -- the sensible solution to me would be to put some stop signs in, causing the drivers to stop, therefore having to accelerate from zero to go around those corners and get up the hill or possibly speed bumps at the top of the hill. You know, again, I'm not sure where the best place is to put a

speed bump.

MR. STRODTMAN: I understand.

MR. NIES: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. NIES: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Nies.

MR. NIES: All right.

MR. CLAPPER: Hi. I'm Adam Clapper of 1916 Ridgemont. Our driveway comes out right at the fork of Highridge and Ridgemont. I don't know if you all can see where I'm pointing there. I won't restate everything that has already been said, but I'm also against the connection -- we are also against the connection of Ridgefield to Ridgemont for all the reasons that have already been mentioned. One thing that I find kind of interesting and perplexing is we have already established that Ridgemont is used for access to Forum Boulevard, and it is actually pretty heavily trafficked on both to and from. The City Planners have identified that this new development is going to increase the traffic burden on the area both due to the 50-plus cars that are going to be intrinsic to the owners of the property and also just because of the pre-existing travel patterns. But for some reason the traffic calming that they propose are only on the western side of this development, completely ignoring the fact that cars can go the other way. I don't know how many of you are familiar -- it sounds like Mr. MacMann might be familiar with our neighborhood, but Highridge going into Ridgemont, very steep hill. Ridgemont traveling east towards College Park, pretty steep hill. That bridge that's right to the east of the creek is not a full two-lane. Cars go, I'm not kidding you, 40 to 50 miles an hour both east and west right in front of my home. We have children. We don't allow them to get their bikes anywhere near the bottom of our drive without us. When we want to use the County House Trail, which is a very rare occurrence, even though our property borders it, it's like a military maneuver. We have to get on our grass -- have a little grassy area there on the north side of our property, and we have to run across the bridge because people are coming 40, 50 miles an hour both -- both ways. To give you an example, just yesterday I was traveling west down Highridge to turn left into my driveway, which I have to slow down pretty substantially because it's a very acute angle. I had my left blinker on and was traveling at no more than 10 miles an hour. A car coming behind me down Highridge came at such a high rate of speed, this person tried to pass me on my left as I was driving into my driveway. I had to slam on my brakes, turn to the right because I was looking in my side view mirror. I turned to my right. The guy slowed down just a little bit and just passed me by bumping off into Ridgemont there and didn't even really try and stop for me and then glared at me as if it was my problem. The gentlemen that -- the couple that lives in the home just across the street from us have also -- I don't know if they are here this evening, but they have also conveyed -- let me know that sometimes when they are backing out of their driveway, people are coming down Highridge at such a high rate of speed that they pass them on the left instead -- instead of slowing down or stopping. So this development and already the pre-existing traffic issues far exceed what those two calming measures that

the City is planning -- the problems are to the east of it, not just the west. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Clapper -- Commissioners, was there any questions for Mr. Clapper? None. Thank you, sir.

MR. KATZ: I'm Marty Katz; I live at 1304 Fieldcrest, a couple blocks away from the proposed development. And I have a few suggestions that may solve some of these problems, at least partially, and a couple of other issues that I would like to address. First of all, I do advocate as in the plat that the connection be made from Ridgemont to Ridgefield; however, with some modification. And I'll get to that in a minute. But by approving this connection, this will enable sharing of the burden of the added traffic by the whole neighborhood rather than keeping it all on Ridgemont. It also allows the residents of the new neighborhood an extra point of egress in case there is an accident or something that they can't get out onto Ridgemont. I would propose moving the development -- the entrance to the development off Ridgemont westward to -- actually, the best location I think is at the Parkridge intersection, and I'll show you that on a map in a section -- in a second. But by doing this, this will address the issue that the group on Ridgefield is concerned about with cut-through traffic and it will add traffic calming devices by adding curvature of the road through the new development. And again, I'll show you that on a map. I would also like to address something related to the storm water that hasn't been addressed here, and that is the developer's proposal is to deal with the storm water by putting it into a pipe. The storm water exists -- runs through an intermittent stream through the property, and as I read it, this intermittent stream is subject to the Clean Water Act, and any modification of this stream by putting it in a pipe would require EPA approval. I'm not an expert; I'm not a lawyer, but I advocate that the City and the developer look into this and consult with the EPA and see if this meets the requirements of the Clean Water Act. And then, finally, I would like to address another issue that hasn't been brought up, and that is the sanitary sewer problem. The sanitary sewers in this neighborhood are already overloaded. They overflow every time there is a big rainstorm. You're adding 25 new homes to an existing overloaded storm water -- or waste water collector system, and I would request that the developer contribute to improving that collector so that it can handle this extra load. Okay. So what I propose to modify the connection is to move the entrance, as you can see here shown in orange, I propose that would be the alternate entrance off of Ridgemont into this development. That would create more curvature in there and less incentive for using that road as a cut-through. It would not eliminate -- reduce the number of lots that could be built by the developer. It would increase their cost for street construction, but that's about it. They could use some of that green space in the center for new lots. And then, finally, this is -- shows you the intermittent stream that I talked about, and this would be put into sewer pipes and then run into a retention pond. And again, I think the EPA needs to be consulted on this as to whether disturbance of that intermittent stream is allowed under federal regulation. Thank you

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? I see none. Mr. Katz, thank you, sir.

MR. FALK: Good evening, everyone. I'll be brief. My name is Dillon Falk, 2200 Ridgefield Road.

I would just like to put -- I don't think even the traffic has actually gone to Ridgefield Road because I just went to put in the picture -- paint a picture in everyone's head what Ridgefield Road looks like. It's not wider than this countertop right here, and there are no sidewalks. And it goes up and down and up and down creating natural speed -- I mean, people naturally want to save gas and they don't want to brake every time they get to the bottom, so naturally, they're going to go 50, 60 miles an hour on it. So like the gentlemen before me was saying, there are so many problems already existing in this neighborhood, I mean, largely due to the commuter traffic which -- it's just because if you open Google Maps on your phone, that's it's going to tell you if you want to get from Stadium Boulevard over to Fairview or something over in this area, it will tell you to cut through the neighborhood. So that will only get worse if Ridgefield Road is connected. You're going to see, I think quadruple -- who knows, 10 times the amount of traffic that is going to hit this neighborhood, and I don't think the City is ready to put in the type of traffic multiple stop signs and speed humps that are -- that would be needed if that were to happen. Furthermore, I think that there is a liability issue because this is now well publicized, and the residents have told you what can happen. Already, a child has been hit in this neighborhood and killed. Okay? Now, the details of that, some people in our neighborhood -- that happened before I moved in. I moved in two years ago. A child was hit and killed. That ruined the life of that family -- the child's family. Another member -- more recently, another -- another neighbor of mine was hit and horribly mangled. And it's just -- there's cyclists, pedestrians, children flood the streets on the weekends. It would be a disaster if the street goes through. You just have to understand it. And if City -- if traffic would actually go to Ridgefield Road and look at it, they would understand and they would say no way can this street go through, at least without some serious thought to design. So that is all I wish to tell you, and if you have any questions, I can answer that.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Falk.

MR. FALK: Thank you.

MS. HUNTER: Good evening, I'm Brianne Hunter, 2206 Ridgefield Road. I would like to tell you that I'm standing here for my children. Mr. Jones and Mr. Crockett are well aware. I've met with them on several occasions and -- I'm trying not to cry, sorry -- and have voiced my concerns about Ridgefield Road being connected. I am one house away from the dead end and newly moved to Columbia. And we chose this location because of its neighborhood -- wonderful neighborhood. And putting a road through the middle of this neighborhood would be disastrous. This is not something that should be taken lightly. Please, please, please listen to the wonderful folks that are telling you that this is -- that this could be potentially dangerous and deadly. And I would also like to offer a rebuttal to Martin. His own words were there would be no sharing. Ridgefield Road will carry 100 percent of the traffic. They are not going to stop. They are going to drive straight through from Stadium to Fairview. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? Ms. Hunter, thank you.

MS. TURNER: Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest. I do not live on Ridgefield, as many people here do. I have lived in this neighborhood for 15 years. It is my home, my only home, and none of us are

happy about this development, but it is coming. And what I ask of you is to support the City's plan that we have fairness in how this traffic is distributed in our neighborhood. I walk at night. I don't get home from Jefferson City until dark most nights. My neighbor sitting next to me walks her dogs three times a day. We have no sidewalks on Fieldcrest, on Parkridge, on Woodhill, none of the neighborhoods. So more cars -- if there's only one exit out of this development, it will crush getting onto College and Stadium, which is already a problem. We have talked to the State through our Councilperson and they don't want to re-examine that we have a dedicated right-turn lane. We will have just a huge amount of traffic. Ridgemont will be even a more difficult neighborhood than it is -- street than it is now, and it is a very difficult street -- Ridgemont. I did talk with Rusty, and it's really up to the City to do some traffic calming. And we've been on the list for, was it 10, 12 years, and we're 12th. I don't know how this would hurry it up. But what I ask for is fairness for the entire neighborhood. Not a lot of my neighbors -- I just came from surgery two weeks ago and I haven't talked to all of my neighbors. I will bring them to the Council meeting and let the Council make changes, I would ask of you, if there's going to be changes. I just ask for fairness because there will be added traffic. One exit from this subdivision will be chaos in my neighborhood, and all of us have to get to College Park -- or most of us, and get onto Stadium. And -- and just having one exit really close to the juncture of those two huge hills. I've almost been killed in this neighborhood, and it's coming down Highridge, once on my bicycle and once in my car when it was slick. It's a bad place for an outlet to the subdivision, but that's where they have it. But if there isn't one further from Ridgefield on Woodhill, it will be really dangerous in my neighborhood. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, questions? Ms. Turner, thank you.

MR. MALLOY: Good evening. David Malloy, 2311 Ridgemont. I just wanted to make a couple comments that weren't addressed. Traffic on Ridgemont has increased over the 13 years that I have lived there, substantially. Once people found out that it's quicker for them to go through the neighborhood to get to the other side of Fairview than to go either Chapel Hill or go down to Broadway. A lot of cars do not turn onto Woodhill to access Ridgefield. They go right down in front of my house and go to Overhill and then turn left and then take a right onto Ridgefield to get to Middlebush. A lot of them do turn down Woodhill. I mean, I've done anecdotal traffic studies because I see a lot of the same cars come through and sometimes I will follow them to see where they're going. Most of the time they are jumping across Fairview to the other subdivision. So some of this has to do with the lack of proper traffic control at Fairview and Chapel Hill and Rollins and Fairview. During rush hour, Chapel Hill stacks up for people going further out to Scott Boulevard, and so those people that just want to turn onto Fairview to get to that other neighborhood on the other side, they choose to cut through our neighborhood on Ridgemont. And I wouldn't have such a big problem with it except that they don't drive the speed limit or less than the speed limit. They drive at least five miles over. And it's real -- the topography of the area is very hilly, and so it is easy to -- if you're going, you know five miles an hour at the top of a hill, you can be going 30 at the bottom of the hill without -- you know, just coasting. So I like the idea of speed tables. I don't think it is a good idea to put a speed table at Woodhill and Ridgemont because during winter, you have to maintain a

good momentum to get up that hill, even after it is cleared and even after they treat it, and having a speed table right at the top of it is going to cause more trouble. I don't have a problem with the speed tables if we can get them in the right places, and taking account the topography and the fact that during winter it is difficult to traverse the road, but I did want to mention that I don't think the connection of Ridgefield to Ridgemont is going to substantially increase the number of cars that travel down Ridgefield as opposed to Ridgemont. However, I do believe that this development is going to impact the area such that some traffic calming needs to be done on both roads. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: What is the speed limit on Ridgefield and Ridgemont?

MR. MALLOY: Twenty-five.

MS. BURNS: So you see people going 35, 40 and above --

MR. MALLOY: Often.

MS. BURNS: -- on a regular basis?

MR. MALLOY: On a regular basis. Now, if I'm out there, I can sometimes, you know, wave at them and let them know that, you know, they don't just coast down there, and, you know, they need to hit the brakes because if you don't tap your brakes, you will be going 35 to 40 miles an hour by the time you get to the bottom of the hill. That's how steep it is. It's the same thing with Highridge. Highridge is a little steeper, and, yeah, the gentleman that mentioned having the trouble with vehicles speeding down that hill when they are trying to access, yeah, I believe it. It's -- because that hill you could be going more than 40 miles an hour, just starting at 25 at the top. And by the time you get down to the bottom, yeah, you'll be going very fast.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, additional questions? Thank you, sir.

MR. MCLEOD: My name is John Mcleod; I live at 2307 Ridgefield Road. And I agree with just about everything I've heard from the public on both sides in terms of Ridgemont and problems there and Ridgefield. In talking about equalizing, I think there is a misunderstanding. The pointing out of Overhill Road was very important because that's what is used in the mornings very frequently. My house is the second block of Ridgefield, which is where you come down Woodhill and make -- make a right turn. And there's a stop sign there which nobody stops at. And they go past my house, which is on a blind curve and they are already at 40 miles an hour at that point. My wife is terrified if she is out doing the gardening. So, anyway, the two things that they were talking about putting up speed tables, of all the places to put them, they would do the least. Now, I'm sorry, I'm not a traffic commissioner, but that intersection at Ridgemont and Woodhill is the most dangerous intersection in Columbia. I have lived here for 37 years. I know this city. That is a very dangerous place. To put a speed bump there is not good. And then to put it right at -- at Woodhill and Ridgemont, well, I'd love it because there is a stop sign there and they don't stop. This will make them stop. But that doesn't solve our problem. Ridgefield Road, if it is connected, is a long road with lots of hills, and these people will be traveling very fast. And people



have said again and again, there are no sidewalks, and it would be very expensive to put in sidewalks. When this neighborhood was designed, it was designed to be something that you didn't have this kind of traffic. When I first came here, we had -- we had a roundabout through downtown Columbia, which was to avoid rush hour -- rush hour then, 37 years ago, was seven to eight minutes long. Now, we have a real rush hour, and it goes right past my house. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, questions of this speaker? Mr. Mcleod, what was your address again?

MR. MCLEOD: 2307 Ridgefield Road.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ridgefield. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, sir.

MR. LUBAHN: Hi. I'm Dennis Lubahn; I live at 2216 Ridgefield Road. I think you've all gotten the letter from me. A couple of new things, and just a variation to clarify things. And I actually have a question. But just to validate certain things, I agree with Marty about the poop fountain. The sewers are overloaded and the poop squirts in the air, and then we call, and they come and spread lime. And it's -- that -- it doesn't happen quite as much as it used to, but it does still happen. And that's the sanitary sewer problem, so I can't imagine that more development is going to help with that. So I really do wish somebody would look into that and see what is going on and quit ignoring it. It keeps getting mentioned and it has repeatedly been ignored. The -- the main punchline here is that it really isn't Ridgemont versus Ridgefield, which is how it has been talked about as what is happening here, it is that -- I mean, there's traffic on both of the roads. The problem that we are, again, repeatedly pointing out and that our president of our homeowner's association -- and we've talked about this and we've worked with the developers when they were making the first plan about how to do this and the various things is that if there is a straight-line shot, the traffic will increase. The traffic will increase. It won't stay the same. It won't be shared. It will all shift from one to the other. Okay? Not completely, but a lot more. I could make a bet with somebody if they would like to, but it is what's going to happen. All right? If they don't believe so, then they don't deserve to be called traffic engineers. There is just something with their understanding of human nature and how people drive. There are no -- it's one fewer turn, one fewer stop sign, and it's really relatively straight once you get going on it. All right. I've got to do the emotional argument. All right? This is a 50-year old quiet cul-de-sac. The plan said it ended there. There is bulges on them. All right? All right. We, through our home owner's association president, very quiet, very calm -- the woman who was cut off because she was talking for many people in the audience to save you guys time -- all right -- had worked with the original developers of this plan. All right? And she had come up with a plan that had instead of one nice quiet neighborhood cul-de-sac, there would be a second quiet nice neighborhood cul-de-sac back-to-back, and life was going to be sweet and nice as far as the super duper traffic on the road. For some reason or other -- not the developers because they were happy with us and we had agreed with them -- the Planning Department changed that. All right? We don't know why. For our purposes they were nasty and they sabotaged us. We don't understand that. We wondered what the heck our president was doing negotiating and talking with the developers if these folks

were going to undo something. Finally, where does it say that two neighborhoods must adjoin so traffic can flow between them fast? Where does it say that in the book? Who made that rule and when? I mean, is that in some planner's handbook that says neighborhoods must connect? Why not two nice quiet cul-de-sacs -- all right -- back-to-back rather than a nice fast raceway in-between? I think that's everything. Thank you so much.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Lubahn.

MS. STORVICK: My name is Arlyn Storvick; I live at 2210 Ridgefield Road. And I'm one of those who has lived there for nearly 50 years. So I'm right -- my kids are here with me, and so I'm just going to make this statement. By proposing traffic calming, they or this proposal is identifying an issue that would be compounded by the connection which is not required within the subdivision regulations. Yeah. So that's all I wanted to say.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? Thank you, ma'am.

MR. MCCABE: Good evening, everyone. My name is Fred McCabe; I'm at 2410 Ridgefield. And my daughter was married on a Friday night, and on Saturday, we had a number of people from Omaha and Kansas City coming to my house for brunch. And about 15 minutes before they were supposed to arrive, a car wound up in my front yard and hit -- hit a tree because -- coming down Ridgefield and couldn't quite make the turn and ran right into my front yard and hit that Redbud tree in my front yard. I think anything to encourage additional traffic coming down Ridgefield and going all the way through is a mistake and dangerous. I do appreciate the hard work of Mr. Crockett and of the City in trying to do this, and you listening to our arguments. And I'm not here to disparage you, but I do think we need to be very careful about extending that road and encouraging more traffic in the neighborhood. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? Mr. McCabe, do you have a suggestion for traffic control?

MR. MCCABE: I think we need to do something to slow it. There was a discussion approximately 10 years ago. I don't remember the exact date of putting a stop sign on Ridgefield and Overhill, and that didn't pass. I think that would be a very valid place to put one. I'm about three houses down from that intersection, and that's where the car ran into my house -- into a tree in my front yard.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, sir. We have another question. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Just a follow up on the stop sign. Was it the community that chose -- vote against it or was it a City decision not to put it in?

MR. MCCABE: Honestly, I don't know. I was at the meeting where we talked about it --

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. MCCABE: And I can't at this point remember exactly why it was voted down. I apologize for that.

MS. LOE: No. That's -- just curious. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional questions, Commissioners? Thank you, Mr. McCabe.

MR. MCCABE: Thank you for your time.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON: Good evening. Bradd Anderson, 2306 Ridgefield. Out of respect for your time, I'm going to shortcut my comments. I'll apologize if they're not as polished as they could be. Long story short, I'm strongly opposed to this extension as well onto Ridgefield. I'm -- I've seen this framed as a fairness issue or sharing the burden, and that appeals to me as a fairness person, but if you actually hang out around Woodhill and Ridgemont and look at the traffic patterns, there is no sharing the burden here. It's a no-brainer. You're going to go down Woodhill, hit Ridgemont and take the straightest shot in town all the way up to Fairview. There is no sharing the burden. If you connect Ridgefield, you have a speedway going on, which as you know is already happening, but you are going to add to that speedway. And we've talked about our children and we've talked about the elderly walkers and our bicyclists, but I don't think anybody has mentioned the children in that new division -- the new subdivision, the Pate Jones children. They're going to -- if they're going to speed down our Ridgefield, you know they are going to speed through that subdivision as well, and we've all probably expressed our opinions -- excuse me -- on the adequacy of those traffic calming measures discussed. But, you know, if you get young families in those -- that subdivision with little kids playing in the streets who don't know any better, they are in danger too. I would so much rather have a nice quiet cul-de-sac where my child gets to ride her bike and those kids are safe and let those kids in that new development ride their bikes and maybe have a little connector between the two so they can ride their bikes together, but let's keep them safe. Let's also maybe make an emergency entrance for emergency only vehicles. If a fire truck needs to get through, we certainly support that, but let's -- let's think about our children and what is logical and safe. Unfortunately, Ordinance 25-42 requires that we have this connection, but, no, it actually doesn't. It encourages it, but not if the vehicular access is unnecessary and inappropriate. My question to you is -- well, what I would like to suggest is making a bad problem worse when the City has done nothing to help us for 10 years is really not necessary. The report you received from the staff even said these issues will exist with or without the construction -- this connection to Ridgefield. I would also suggest that making Ridgefield more unsafe to accomplish nothing is really not appropriate. There is just better things to do. It's not a blind ordinance. You have the power to make changes and we really need your help. So, thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions of this speaker? Mr. Anderson, thank you.

MR. CARSON: Hi. My name is Christian Carson; I live at 1301 Parkridge Drive. If I stand on my porch, I can see all of this property down the street. A lot of people walk on my street, and all of these other streets walking their dogs, et cetera, and with their kids on bikes headed down to Ridgemont, and I have to ask you why? It is so dangerous to get on Ridgemont, but they have -- it's a great place to go. I have two things to point out. First of all, there is a history with this property and its development. First of all, the developer wanted to build apartment townhouses there and only went to the people with

Ridgemont twisting their arm thinking that they wouldn't want to have their road punched through naturally, because punching that road through is a disaster for these neighborhoods. It's plain and simple. Now we're going to have a development with the correct level of housing, but it's clear that there's going to be crowdedness and all of that. So please be fair and please consider that ultimately this development itself is a bad idea, let alone cutting through Ridge-- cutting Ridgefield through is an extremely bad idea. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions of this speaker? Thank you, Mr. Carson.

MR. MILLER: Good evening. My name is Ron Miller; I live at 2208 Ridgemont, which is the very top of the hill on Ridgemont. I'm lucky enough to tell when traffic is coming because they're revving their engine to go up the hill. Either way, you can hear them coming. I'm here for my grandkids. We need to do something about the traffic. A calming device for me is extending Ridgefield. It would reduce the traffic on Ridgemont. It has gotten worse in the last 20 years I've been there. Let's do something, please. That's all I got.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions? Thank you, Mr. Miller.

MR. COLBERT: Good evening. Caleb Colbert, attorney at 601 East Broadway. I am the attorney for the applicant. Again, thank you for your time this evening. I know it is sort of unusual to have an attorney speak at a subdivision plat action, but given the public comment and some of the correspondence received, I felt like we should chime in on this. Obviously given the public comment, the public has concerns with the City policy regarding connectivity, but that is not what we're here tonight to decide. At the core what we are here to decide tonight is does this plat meet the subdivision requirements. And I direct your attention to the staff report which reads, "The proposed preliminary plat has been reviewed by staff and is found to be compliant with all subdivision regulations subject to the installation of the recommended traffic calming devices. The public has discussed a lot of alternatives and they've thrown out a lot of ideas, but that's not what we're here tonight to decide. We're here to look at this plat. And the City staff has concluded that it meets the subdivision regulations. Mr. Crockett testified that it met the subdivision regulations. And I would direct your attention to some case law that says that when a subdivision ordinance specifies minimum standards to which a preliminary plat must conform, it is arbitrary as a matter of law to deny approval of a plat that meets those standards. Accordingly, if the plat is within the use permitted by the zoning classification and meets the development regulation set forth in the subdivision ordinance, then the plat by definition is in harmony with the existing subdivisions it would also by definition be in character with the existing subdivisions. Again, I understand why people want to live on a dead end road. I get that. But that is not what the City policy is, and we have an -- as an applicant, we have an obligation to submit a plat that complies with the subdivision regulations, and that is what we have done here. So, respectfully, I would ask for your support and your recommendation of approval this evening. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Colbert, that was the 435 you were reading -- RSMO?

MR. COLBERT: Pardon?

MR. MACMANN: Which -- what was the number on that?

MR. COLBERT: On the case?

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MR. COLBERT: It is 847 S.W. 2nd 867, Schaefer versus Cleveland.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. And you were referencing one of the State codes. Which one was that?

MR. COLBERT: I was representing -- it's --

MS. RUSHING: State statute.

MR. MACMANN: It's a State statute. Okay. You're hinging your argument on if the staff determines that all subdivision compatibility issues are addressed then it must be approved; is that what you're saying?

MR. COLBERT: That is correct. That is --

MR. MACMANN: If the premise that I just set forth is not the case, then your argument holds no water. Correct?

MR. COLBERT: I'm not sure what you're asking.

MR. MACMANN: I'll be much more direct. Let's say that the staff's assessment of the road network and the road impact is incorrect, than it does not meet all planning requirements.

MR. COLBERT: And I'm not sure that we have had competent expert testimony tonight from people that are qualified to offer the expert testimony that is required to satisfy the technical and engineering requirements of subdivision regulations.

MR. MACMANN: I appreciate that. As you can tell from the comments behind you and I can tell you from having driven this a few hundred times, I believe the staff's -- with all due respect, gentlemen, your view is optimistic at best. I just -- I'm sorry -- it's very optimistic. That's all the questions I have. Thank you very much.

MR. COLBERT: Thank you. Any other questions?

MR. STRODTMAN: Any questions for this speaker? None.

MR. COLBERT: Thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Colbert. Any additional speakers that would like to have a moment? I see none. We'll go ahead and close the public input portion.

#### **PUBLIC INPUT CLOSED**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners?

MS. RUSHING: Well, I'd --

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: -- like to ask a question of staff.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, ma'am. Go ahead.

MS. RUSHING: What is the length of this road as proposed? Do you know approximately?

MR. PALMER: It's -- I honestly don't. It's --

MS. RUSHING: Around 700 feet, maybe?

MR. PALMER: It's 750, I think, to 800.

MS. RUSHING: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: Additional questions? I've got one. What other options were considered? I assume the original plan that one of the speakers referred to about two cul-de-sacs back-to-back was obviously eliminated due to the fire department's desire to no longer continue to do cul-de-sacs where possible and that's the last resort. Were there other options considered besides that scenario?

MR. ZENNER: That particular option was considered as part of a planned district with a private street system, and we have a standing policy that private streets do not connect to public.

MR. STRODTMAN: Correct.

MR. ZENNER: I would tell you that our fire service was not satisfied with that general solution. So it would have been a compromise given the nature of the original development on this property. It would not have been, as we have pointed out this evening, consistent with the general regulations that we are applying in this instance.

MR. STRODTMAN: And I understand why we only have -- we don't want one exit only. That is not suitable either, so I understand why we need two points. Was -- one of the speakers mentioned the Parkridge Drive scenario. I understand that -- you know, I drove this a couple times out there in the last week or so just to look at it and I was there in the morning once and I was there this evening before I came in here just to see kind of how it looks before five. How does that look -- that Parkridge Drive scenario? Was that --

MR. ZENNER: It was not --

MR. STRODTMAN: It seems to be kind of difficult with that hill and --

MR. ZENNER: It was not evaluated as an option at this point, and in conferencing with our traffic engineer, that would require additional evaluation to determine and rule that out. However, given the topography in this particular area, it would probably not necessarily meet our site distance requirements. Mr. Crockett may have done a more detailed investigation of that as this development was being laid out, but it has not been something that we have reviewed specifically.

MR. STRODTMAN: Can we - can we discuss why the traffic engineers wanted the traffic control measures where they placed them and not some or something to the east?

MR. ZENNER: I will let Mr. Jake Ray speak to that. He is with our traffic engineering division.

MR. RAY: Yeah. With that in particular we were trying to get something that was close to the planned development as possible. I mean, we fully understand that as a staff we will be looking at this whether this development is allowed or not for traffic calming. As has been mentioned this is -- on our neighborhood traffic management program, it is number 11 and number 12 currently in this current year. We've done -- gathered more information this current year on that, and we will be coming out with our report after the first of the year once we gather all the data. So I'm not sure where it will fall in this upcoming year, but I would anticipate somewhere in that neighborhood.

MR. STRODTMAN: That it would stay in the number 11 and 12?

MR. RAY: Somewhere in that general neighborhood. You know, somewhere eight to twelve, probably.

MR. STRODTMAN: And obviously you probably need time to do your analysis and your -- you know, you look at accounts, et cetera, but why wasn't something more considered to the east? I mean, it does seem to me that that Highridge -- coming off that Highridge going west is -- you know, it's a huge drop, and if you're not turning on College there, you know, you're going to pick up some speed and, you know, there's a crossing there with the sign in the road. Was there anything considered on the east side -- traffic control measures? I mean, you know, obviously that is something that is probably going to be addressed as number 11 or 12, and we're specifically talking about this project, but I'm just curious if that's been a discussion or not.

MR. RAY: Not at this time it wasn't. I mean, we've -- we were just trying to try to focus, you know, some traffic control devices to try to address some of the concerns that are -- currently exist and try to anticipate some of the issues that will be -- could come with this development.

MR. STRODTMAN: Was the City the only party that did a traffic study? Was there a third party?

MR. RAY: No.

MR. STRODTMAN: No. Thank you. Commissioners? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: What's not shown on this map is that College Park is a neighborhood collector and Bray is also a neighborhood collector. Correct?

MR. RAY: Correct.

MS. LOE: That's correct. Okay. And Bray is going to, on the CATSO plan, connect through to Scott Boulevard via Dublin. Correct?

MR. RAY: Yes.

MS. LOE: Yeah. So I think one of my concerns is that we have two neighborhood collectors that are dumping into this neighborhood. I see them as dumping. I happen to live on College Park, so I'm adjacent to this, and am aware of some of the issues, and I'm aware of how well speed tables work or don't work. They have helped. I will tell you all that. So we are doing better. But I think we were number one on the list when we got those, and just so the Commission knows, we have a 25 per hour speed limit on College Park with a 20 per hour during the day because we have a school at the top and bottom of the hill. And we have some hills, and I'm not sure if you've done your speed tests yet, but I know on College Park cars were tested at going 44 miles an hour.

MR. RAY: That's correct.

MS. LOE: So it's a bit excessive when you have that hilly terrain without stop signs. In light of the -- my observations about where the neighborhood collectors are, can you tell me what the City's view or overview is of where they are doing this traffic calming study? Especially -- and this is in conjunction with my concern -- or my previous comments about no longer having the ability to connect through to Scott. It does appear that this neighborhood is coming under some pressure, given that there is the only

north-south connection is at Fairview and Forum, and no possibility moving forward with another north-south connection. So you have two neighborhood collectors -- one coming in from the west, one coming down from the north. How -- how does it -- they're going to get connected whether or not the City draws that line. So what's the City's viewpoint or response to that?

MR. RAY: The -- from the traffic calming side, we will definitely look at how to treat the existing traffic. There hasn't been a widespread study to try to determine where the most appropriate spot is to try to find relief for this area.

MS. LOE: So you haven't yet identified where in that neighborhood -- you haven't tested traffic speeds yet?

MR. RAY: We've done the speed data.

MS. LOE: And where have you done those?

MR. RAY: There were several locations between Fairview and the subject proposed development that we did. And, you know, it was generally the 85th percentile, which is what we use to set the speed limits, is generally around 41 miles an hour.

MS. LOE: Okay. But you didn't go east of the subject property to Forum?

MR. RAY: I believe we have --

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. RAY: -- some data from there. I don't -- it wasn't done this year, but we have previous years. What we did -- have updated this year was west of the subject data -- or the development we are talking about today.

MS. LOE: I guess I feel as if -- I mean, most of the comments that were brought up tonight were not about the development per se, but about the traffic in the neighborhood. And I feel as if this development has been dropped into a traffic issue. So it's more a question, and I understand Mr. Colbert's comments that we're -- we are looking at the proposed development, but that development is proposing connections that do impact the traffic. So there is some interrelation there. I'm just going to leave my comments at that for now.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: Could you tell me how -- what the cost is of a four-way stop sign on --

MR. RAY: You know, you're looking at somewhere \$80 to \$100 per sign.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Russell, I don't think that -- Ms. Russell, if your question is more -- that probably doesn't address curbs and, you know, streets.

MS. RUSSELL: No, it doesn't. But I'm thinking that a number of four-way stops might help that traffic. I mean, I know we've said -- they've said that, you know, you could hit your brakes and go sliding right through. And I've lived in four-way stop places where people tap, tap, and go.

MS. LOE: We've been -- we were told on College Park that stop signs -- they just accelerate between stop signs and that the speed tables were -- no, they were the preferred --

MS. RUSSELL: I believe it. I believe it.



MS. LOE: -- method of going forward.

MS. RUSSELL: I'm good. I just was curious about the cost.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I just had a clarification. You had said that your tests -- your speed tests were between Fairview and the subject site; is that correct --

MR. RAY: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: -- in the past 12 months? And you said your traffic point was about 41 mph; is that correct?

MR. RAY: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: And the speed limits in there are 20 and 25. Right?

MR. RAY: Primarily 25.

MR. MACMANN: Twenty-five. So 16 over?

MR. RAY: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. And that's -- I'll verify that that's at least how fast people go. Thank you very much.

MR. RAY: Yeah.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Yes. What I've learned tonight is there are some obvious serious pre-existing conditions that need to be addressed. And it seems like, with respect to Mr. Colbert, this new subdivision could exacerbate those tremendously. So that is my thought.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners? Mr. Harder?

MR. HARDER: Yes. I definitely feel that this has some pre-existing issues. You know, 20 years ago, I grew up on this side of town, and I don't use this cut-through, but Columbia does have its cut-throughs and people take advantage of this. So I think it has been a problem that has been going on for a while and will continue on as well too. I think if they can try to tie something together with the development that actually, you know, helps the whole overall situation, I think it would be better than -- I mean, if -- like it has been said, this is a problem that was, you know, definitely here before the development was even proposed. So I think if there is any way to figure out an idea that would, you know, slow down traffic or redirect traffic, I would support that.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: My famous words are going to have to come out.

MS. RUSHING: Win.

MR. STANTON: You need a win-win here. Now, counsel kind of got me. I was kind of leaning, and then he told me what I'd better do because I better do it. It kind of opened the gates up. We're here to talk about this because there is room for negotiation. If we follow the -- if we follow what counsel said that if it fits and everything looks good we should approve, well, that means that we shouldn't approve any variances or anything else if it fits. So, no, I don't agree with that. We need to talk about this. Traffic is

an issue here. The development looks great, it's just the traffic. What can we do? Where can we work it? I'm looking at it initially -- I don't know how the neighborhood would think about it, but extending the Ridgfield Road into a cul-de-sac and making it longer without connecting it and just extending it. I don't know. We -- there has got to be a compromise. These people have money on the table. It's got to be a compromise. No one side can win it all. How can we fix it? What can we do? Is a cul-de-sac right though and not a connection would be cool? In my eyes, just looking at it, the Parkridge connection I -- I can see where you are going with that, but it's still going to create additional traffic there. So how can we get a win-win here? I like the development, I just don't like the traffic. What can we do?

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional discussion? Would somebody like to frame a motion for consideration? Prefer not all at once. We have a hard time keeping track of the notes.

MS. LOE: I -- I just -- let's go back to the traffic calming measures because I think -- I feel as if the speed tables are a bit of an aftermarket product, so to speak, in that you bring them to a -- we have them on College Park because it is an existing street, we have limited ability to do other measures and the expense of it. In this case -- and this is one of the reasons I asked Mr. Crockett if he had explored additional alternatives within the development. If -- and, Mr. Crockett, why don't you come forward, and if you had some additional -- I'm thinking if we can get something more included --

MR. CROCKETT: Absolutely.

MS. LOE: -- that makes it less of a by-pass situation.

MR. CROCKETT: Absolutely.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Crockett, sorry --

MR. CROCKETT: I'm sorry.

MR. STRODTMAN: Technicalities.

MR. CROCKETT: Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Ms. Loe, after you had that comment and -- with us tonight is Shawn White, a traffic engineer with Crawford Bunte and Brammeier. While she is not here representing this project necessarily -- it's another proposal on the agenda tonight -- she did have a conversation with me about the idea of traffic calming in specified locations, you're better to try to defer the traffic away. Don't allow traffic to utilize the new street extension.

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. CROCKETT: Try to do exactly what you mentioned. Do bump outs, do -- she's not in big favor of speed bumps, speed tables within the street, but do bump outs. Let's neck that in. And I believe that staff has had that in their staff report that if speed tables at the two specified locations are not adequate or not desired, then by all means, putting two of them at the entrance and the exit or the two sides of this development would be most appropriate. I think we are very well, you know -- very in favor of doing that. We can come in here, we can neck that street down at the line of sight, so when someone comes on Ridgmont and they look over and they see a narrow street to start with, that's not very

lucrative for them to get on and go through that area if it's going to slow them down. It doesn't really help the residents on Ridgemont, but it -- what it does is it doesn't exacerbate that problem. It just doesn't really alleviate much of the problem. But if we do that at both locations and try to defer the traffic from not utilizing our street -- our new street, then I think that can be a win-win, Mr. Stanton, by keeping that traffic from utilizing our street. Again, it doesn't really solve the overall issue that most residents had tonight, but that's an existing issue. You're exactly right. Anything that we propose is going to be a band aid on the issue. It's a problem that exists today, and there is nothing we can do about that as a developer. There is nothing we can do to solve that, but what we can do is try to keep it -- impacts on the dead end portion of Ridgefield to a very minimum. So that's what we can certainly try to do.

MS. LOE: Who was installing the speed tables?

MR. CROCKETT: That would have been -- the two that were proposed --

MS. LOE: That were shown earlier.

MR. CROCKETT: The City is asking the developer to pay for those two locations.

MS. LOE: So could we as part of the win-win negotiations leave two speed tables at locations outside the development at locations agreed to by City and neighborhood plus measures within the development to reduce calming -- or increase calming.

MR. CROCKETT: We -- what I would --

MS. LOE: Bump-outs or --

MR. CROCKETT: -- recommend doing is, yes, let's do the on-site traffic calming, the bump-outs on the -- within the development itself.

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. CROCKETT: And then allow us to work with City staff to acquire appropriate proposals on what it would cost to do those two off-site locations.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: And then the developer will supply to the City that -- those funds in order for them to be built so that we're not negotiating a location. I think the locations are still up in the air. I mean, no one -- here or here, I think that is a serious discussion between the residents and the City.

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. CROCKETT: And if we supply the funds to build those, I think that would be a much better option than introducing us into the mix in trying to figure out where they need to go.

MS. LOE: Because I think that would address in part the larger issue, which we have all discussed. This is much larger than this concentrated area. We're going to Overhill and we're going up to Highridge. So where -- where would that do the most benefit? And then if we can make this extension as least attractive as possible, I think that could make it more appealing.

MR. CROCKETT: You want us to build an ugly development?

MS. LOE: Just the extension. Just the road.

MR. CROCKETT: I understand. I understand. Yes. I think we could do that. We would want

some sort of a cap. I believe those traffic calming devices that we had originally priced them out, they are about \$7,500 -- \$7,000 to \$7,500. We probably want to cap those. But we would work with the City to acquire what we believe is a fair price for those and then supply that to the City. And then we would do the bump-outs within our development to discourage the traffic to utilize our new street, if that would be sufficient.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Zenner, what would be the mechanism that would -- to -- I mean, how would we -- how would the City handle that in knowing that the locations might take a while to be determined? How would we be guaranteed that that -- those funds would be there and ready?

MR. ZENNER: You could --

MR. STRODTMAN: Mostly for the people in the room to hear.

MR. ZENNER: You could -- the most appropriate way would be to apply a condition that would be conditioned upon the approval of a final plat, which is a Council action. And it would basically be a prerequisite of us forwarding the plat to Council. We would have to have receipt of those funds as to whatever that cap may be. And then, of course, the appropriate design of whatever additional traffic calming internal to the development would be required, such as the bump-outs, as you have been discussing to dissuade traffic from moving through the development at its connection point as it is proposed. And you can -- you can offer that as an alternative to the staff recommendation, if that is what you're contemplating to do. If I may, I would like to ask Mr. Crockett a question, just as it relates to the exploration of other design options as we sit here and we listen to what the public's concern is. We've heard what the Commission generally is maybe contemplating that regardless of what happens at this point, if this project were to be approved, we have background traffic that is going to potentially be exacerbated, so we have a much broader issue. Was there any exploration of potentially doing something with the existing College Park right-of-way that exists? And potentially looking at pulling in where it was originally contemplated in 1966 that that roadway come back out to Ridgemont?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. No, we didn't really -- we didn't explore that too much for the simple fact, Mr. Zenner, that existing right-of-way -- two things. It is hard to build a new City street completely within the existing right-of-way or a right-of-way without going over. We also in discussion with the residents that lived along that area, we agreed to try to preserve those -- that vegetative cover that runs through there as best as possible for the previous PUD development. And so we knew that was a concern and something that they really had -- that they had high -- you know, high thoughts of. And so we wanted to try to preserve that. With that being the case that they didn't -- they wanted to preserve their vegetation through there, we certainly didn't think that they wanted a road beside their house. And so that was a pretty good reason why --

MR. ZENNER: Let me go beyond that then because I would have anticipated that potentially to be what the response was. If you were to do an orientation of lots that ran east-west backing into that former road right-of-way or backing up to the former road right-of-way, which is currently the vegetative cover --

MR. CROCKETT: Uh-huh,

MR. ZENNER: -- and bringing the road back around to, as one speaker this evening suggested, provided we have adequate site distances to where you then have the ability to backfeed what comes down toward the trail as a cul-de-sac.

MR. CROCKETT: No. No. Now, actually, we did look at that option.

MR. ZENNER: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: That was an option that we did look at is bringing another road out -- and I believe it was Parkridge Drive coming out through there. I think Mr. -- Mr. Ray will speak to this. We try to avoid four-way intersections where at all possible. That created another four-way intersection at a -- what I call a least desirable location. So a four-way location -- a four-way intersection, which is not necessarily all that desirable for traffic issues at a least desirable location is not a good idea. Furthermore, when we started looking at it in the development, it added a substantial amount of public street. And we -- not gain anything by it. Now, we're not talking about just simply we added more concrete with no more lots, we added more concrete with less lots. It also what that did is it also puts a lot more burden on the City with less tax space on it. So we didn't think that was an economical situation, and the solution that it tried to solve, it just didn't solve it because, again, a four-way intersection at a bad location is not a -- wasn't a good idea in our eyes.

MR. ZENNER: Okay. Thank you. That -- I just wanted to make sure the Commission knew at least where we are looking at this point as this is a R-1 zoned property. You deny this development if that is the desire of the Commission, this property is entitled to be developed at some return. And as R-1, we will have a street at some point. We may have a different iteration of this plan, and depending on how you are desiring for the connection to or not to exist that promotes through traffic from the west heading eastbound or possibly heading westbound down this extension of Ridgefield, while this project has the connection, a future project will likely also propose that or they may request a variance, which at that point, as Mr. Crockett pointed out earlier, we as a staff based upon how we interpret the regulations -- and ultimately Council can look at the more vague and nebulous criteria about its impact to adjacent neighborhoods, that is not something that has any concrete evaluable standards associated with, and therefore that is a judgment call that is left beyond our staff's level. But we will be likely back at a similar situation potentially with a different packaged development. No variance was requested on this. If it had been, which is as was proposed here or stated earlier this evening, staff was the responsible party for the denial or the withdrawal of the PUD plan. But no, our position in that PUD plan review did not change from its concept review to its submittal to its withdrawal by the applicant. We did not support the cul-de-sac'ing of the streets from day one. We felt that the connection was essential in order to -- as it has been stated in this staff report, to ensure that the connectivity of two contiguous similar developments was actually provided as a means of providing public safety and public service provisions. So there have been options explored with this, which I think is something that I asked -- why I asked my questions. There are possibly other options that the Commission may want to consider as it relates to the condition,

which while we respectfully understand Mr. Colbert's position and his firm's position, we disagree with. The Planning Commission under its provision within the Code does have its defined responsibilities as making a recommendation of approval, denial, approval with conditions or you can request tabling for additional information. And that Section 25-10 of the Code does allow you to apply reasonable conditions. And when we evaluate the Code as a whole, we evaluate it not only under the technical requirements -- and sometimes those technical requirements, in order to be met in our opinion, do need to have reasonable conditions associated to them. Hence, the reason for our traffic engineering's department recommendation of the speed tables. We felt it reasonable to meet the intent of the regulations, and that is why it was offered. So with that, any other questions for staff, we'll be more than happy to answer.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton, did you have a question?

MR. STANTON: Well, I'm still conflicted. I understand where the City is going with the connectivity. I was looking at a cul-de-sac solution with maybe an emergency access at the termination of Ridgefield Road as it is now. I -- so that would still give you the connectivity for the purposes of what you wanted, but it would kind of calm the traffic issue that the citizens are looking at. I'm just throwing it out there, if that was considered and why that --

MR. ZENNER: And if I may respond to that because we anticipated that potentially to be a recommendation. In consultation with our legal department as it relates to the closure of a public street, it does not -- it is not generally supported at the staff level for the closure of a public street to be made right out of the gate because there are public streets on either side. And to close a public street does not allow the public -- tax-paying public to travel on those roadways that they are ultimately paying for. Therefore, the safety-related aspects associated with that, should they turn out to be real, the Council does hold within its power to potentially close streets at that point. We would not as a general practice however promote closing public streets right out of the gate without substantiated evidence that in fact the problems that are perceived to be occurring have not yet occurred. So that is always an option in the background that the Council could come back by petition of the neighbors or even by recommendation of our traffic engineering department that the safety matters are such that they do require some other technique in which to manage; hence the reason for speed tables, speed humps, possibly stop signs or other traffic control in particular locations. It is all based upon the criteria of evaluation. It is entirely left up to this Planning Commission, and then ultimately the City Council if this roadway is closed for the purposes of emergency access only either as a through street or as a cul-de-sac. But that is not an issue that we as a staff believe is our role to make that final decision. Ours is to ensure that connectivity is met in this particular instance, as we have pointed out.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I'm going to make a couple of statements and then proceed. There has been a lot of comment tonight about the effect of this extension on the existing neighborhood, but I also see a

detrimental effect of the extension on the proposed development because the traffic in this area, it's bizarre. And you're just going to send that same problem through the new neighborhood as is in the existing neighborhood. I understand from the length of the street that there would be a problem with a cul-de-sac, and I'm hoping that the engineers will come up with a creative solution to this. And with that in mind, I will make a motion because I think we need to vote on this and move on. I move for approval of Case No. 17-8, A request by Crockett Engineering (applicant) on behalf of Ridgemont Development LLC for approval of a 28-lot preliminary plat to be known as "Ridgemont Park".

MR. STRODTMAN: Do we have a second?

MS. LOE: Were there any conditions?

MS. RUSHING: No.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any questions, Commissioners?

MR. MACMANN: Is there a second?

MS. LOE: No.

MR. STRODTMAN: I see no second.

MR. TOOHEY: I'll go ahead and second just so we can --

MS. RUSHING: So we can vote.

MR. TOOHEY: -- move on.

MR. STRODTMAN: A motion has been placed on the table and has been seconded by Mr. Toohey. Is there any questions or discussions on this motion, Commissioners? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a very brief comment. It would seem from our discussions with staff and our folks here and Mr. Crockett that to take a phrase away from Mr. Stanton this one is not quite ready for prime time here. Whatever we move forward, it is currently not on the plat. I'm just saying this thing needs work if it's going to move forward, and we've all -- Ms. Loe, several others have mentioned we could do X, we could do Y, we could do Z, but that stuff has not been done and we have an existing -- whether the traffic increases on Ridgefield or not, we have -- or Ridgemont, we have 41 to the west, I would submit higher on Highridge. I've travelled it. That is crazy. Fifty more cars, if nothing else, if no one changes their traffic pattern, it will make it worse. I plan to vote no on this -- on the approval. Thank you

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any further discussion, comments, questions, clarification about this motion? Yes, ma'am?

MS. RUSSELL: I have one.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, Ms. Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: After we vote on this, if it is voted down, can we revote on -- with a different motion on it?

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay.

MR. STRODTMAN: As always.

MS. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes. Any additional discussion on the motion that has been made and seconded? If not, may we have a roll call, please, Ms. Secretary.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting No: Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodman. Motion denied 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: That is nine in denial.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Additional discussion, motions, Commissioners? Yes, Ms. Burns -- oh, Ms. Russell. Sorry.

MS. RUSSELL: I'm going to try and frame a different motion --

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes, ma'am.

MS. RUSSELL: -- regarding Case No. 17-8. Approval for the preliminary plat for Ridgemont Park with the added condition of traffic calming measures be negotiated and funded by the developer in addition to traffic calming measures at the entrance of both -- through the tract.

MR. STRODTMAN: Do we have a second on this motion?

MR. STANTON: I'll second that.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton, thank you for that second. Ms. Russell has made a motion and it has been seconded by Mr. Stanton. Commissioners, is there any discussion on this motion? Mr. Harder?

MR. HARDER: Yes. If I could get clarification of -- so that would be traffic calming patterns from both entrances to the subdivision? Okay.

MR. STANTON: Can we --

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Can we make it more specific? Bump-outs or bump-ins? I mean -- or are we just leaving it up to --

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Russell? Your motion.

MR. STANTON: Because traffic calming can be a speed bump, which doesn't work --

MS. RUSHING: No, I mean the traffic department --

MR. STANTON: -- or a sign that says slow down.

MS. RUSHING: Wouldn't that be --

MS. RUSSELL: I'll add that the entrance and exit through the tract include pretty good bump-outs.

MR. STANTON: I just wanted to get the technical -- whatever technique we want to use.

MS. RUSSELL: That's technical. Pretty good. Yeah.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. That will work.

MR. ZENNER: Do we --



MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Zenner, would you give us a little --

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. I just want to make sure that we are all singing out of the same hymnal here before we are done. So we've got traffic calming to include some pretty significant improvements at the entrance and the exit of the subject site. And you had also requested that off-site improvements be funded by the developer.

MS. RUSSELL: Negotiated and funded.

MR. ZENNER: Negotiated. Is there any limitation as to the extent of those traffic improvements off-site from the project or any monetary cap associated with that?

MR. STANTON: I guess you could -- as recommended by staff.

MR. ZENNER: And the way that you could approach this is the staff's recommendation is, as currently within the staff report has requested, that two off-site speed tables be installed. If the negotiation is intended to have traffic calming devices as negotiated in an equivalent value to those two speed tables, that may be appropriate to add to your motion so we have clarified the extent financially that the developer is being obligated.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Russell, would you like to add anything to your motion?

MS. RUSSELL: I will probably reframe the whole thing.

MR. STRODTMAN: If that is accept-- if you would like to withdraw your motion.

MS. RUSSELL: Oh, let me withdraw that one.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay. Would you like --

MS. RUSSELL: And try a new one.

MR. STRODTMAN: Okay.

MS. RUSSELL: All right. In Case #17-8, approval of the preliminary plat for Ridgemont Park with added condition of traffic calming measures outside the subject plat to be negot-- two traffic calming measures to be negotiated --

MS. LOE: So maybe two traffic calming measures outside of the subject plat to -- equivalent of two speed tables to be negotiated with the City and neighborhood?

MR. ZENNER: I'm good at framing motions for you, so would you like me to frame a motion for you?

MS. LOE: Yes, Mr. Zenner.

MS. RUSSELL: That would be great.

MR. ZENNER: Okay. And this will be Ms. Russell's motion when we are all done.

MS. RUSSELL: It will be my motion.

MR. ZENNER: Okay. If I can see the staff report so I will start this properly. Front page. All right. All right. We are -- we are making a motion to approve an application submitted by Crockett Engineering on behalf of Ridgemont Development LLC for approval of a 28-lot preliminary plat to be known as "Ridgemont Park", subject to the applicant negotiating with the City's traffic engineering department to install two off-site traffic calming devices in an equivalent value to two speed tables, and to

install traffic calming devices at the entrance to the development from Ridgemont Road and at Fieldcrest Road.

MS. RUSSELL: Ridgefield.

MR. ZENNER: Ridgefield. I'm sorry. Ridgefield. Ridgefield Road that may consist of very large bump-outs.

MS. RUSSELL: That works. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Do we have a second on that motion.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton seconds the motion that was made by Ms. Russell via Mr. Zenner. Any discussion on this motion, Commissioners? Questions, comments? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I don't see how this guarantees that it fixes the problem. We have existing -- I just -- you know, just to be pragmatic, we have an existing problem which will have more traffic on it east and west. This may be helpful within the subdivision itself. But what I'm leery about is we don't have good studies to the east for sure and those sites to the west seem to be incomplete, and they aren't necessarily -- I plan to vote no on this because I don't believe it addresses all the issues. And I believe also there are -- we didn't get into, because the traffic has been so salient, the storm water issues, which is a concern of mine and the sewage issue, which is a concern of mine also. So I still plan to vote no because I don't think we -- I think we are trying to be -- we tried to address this and we're not sure what we are doing, and that concerns me. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I beg to differ. I'm a little versed in things like this, but we've got to create a -- I'm trying to create a win-win of both sides are equally dissatisfied. I think I won. We've got the connectivity that the City wants. Yes, we still got through traffic, but we've created barriers to slow it down significantly. We have the option, as Mr. Zenner has recommended, that if these problems do come to reality, as the citizens have expressed, there is an option to close it down or to -- we have other measures still on the table to use. Like I said, we -- you know, people have got money on the table and we've got existing neighborhoods. Unless you have a better solution, this is what we worked out.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe, did you have something?

MS. LOE: Yes, I believe the development at two units per acre, which is very low, and that they are giving 58 percent of the developed area back as open space to the community is actually quite a generous proposal for the community. And this is R-1, and you could get something much denser coming in. So I believe this is a great development for the area. I mean, again, I live adjacent to it. I use that County House Trail, and I'm really pleased to see that continuing to be buffered. I'm also in support of promoting infield development closer into the City core. So I can't really push against -- I understand we have infrastructure issues and that we are working on those, but I have to support bringing more housing closer into the city than pushing it out to the perimeter of the city. I do not think this solves all the problems. I think the community's neighborhood has a ways to go on that, but I don't think it's this

developer's burden to solve all the problems. I think what we are trying to do is acknowledge that this development is bringing some added traffic into the neighborhood and that hopefully with the two added street calming measures, that you will get a start in getting some street calming measures because it sounds like you are still down the list a little bit on the City's plan and that the City can augment that when they do get to you and do complete your study and can provide some funds to the neighborhood.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just two points real quickly. To Mr. Stanton's point about money on the table, Mr. Crockett and associates do have money on the table and they do hope to make money, and that's awesome. There are some folks on Ridgefield who may see their property values go down, so there is money on their side of the table. To Ms. Loe's point, rather -- just rather quickly about the five-plus acres they are -- and that's awesome that they do that, but at the same time, the cost developing that property -- I go by this property probably all the time. This floods with great regularity. The cost of developing that is high. Just in -- and yes, that's a generous offer, and I'm glad they do it, but there is not much else you can do with it economically, particularly at an R-1 level. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Any additional discussion? Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: I would just like to point out in response to Mr. MacMann's question, you do have a letter from our sanitary sewer utility as it relates to the sewer issue, and it is a rather detailed letter. However, it does make reference in the second paragraph of that letter that there has been evaluation. There has been activity as it relates to the sanitary sewer issues, and as the letter states, a majority based on their review over the past five fiscal years, October of '11 through September of 2016, there has been significant I & I issues associated with that, which we are currently in and I & I Reduction Program, which many of those improvements, as this letter reads, have been made. In 2014, the letter speaks specifically to the fact that staff identified equipment and operational procedures that could be modified at the wastewater treatment plant which would significantly reduce the frequency and the duration of wet weather overflows in several locations throughout the city. These modifications were completed in July of 2015 with the expansion of our sewer treatment plant. And since that time, there has only been one overflow reported in this particular area. The -- and that was after almost a six-inch rainfall event. In addition to the modifications, as I pointed out, the I & I activities in the County House Branch Watershed are ongoing and basically significant portions of the sewer collection system within that watershed are being -- have been rehabilitated. There currently is one ongoing project in the basin, and the sewer system evaluation survey was recently completed for the portion of the collection system in the County House Branch Watershed, which has not been. The final rehabilitation project for the basin will be completed in 2017, and the letter concludes that the completion of these projects greatly reduce the amount of I & I entering the system, which is a cause of the overflows as evaluated by our system specialists and engineers, and that their final conclusion is that the proposed Ridgemont Park Project will have negligible impact to the operation of the sanitary sewer collection system under existing operating scenarios. The beginning portion of this letter reads to the flows that this particular development will

generate as well as to what the capacity is within this watershed, which are roughly one to -- the flow is about 1.3 million gallons per day with a sewer main capacity of 5.3 million. As far as it relates to the environmental conditions, that question has been -- was raised to our staff earlier today. The intermittent stream that is identified was a result of the grading activities that occurred on this site as part of the preparation for the Lutheran Church's operation. It does not require an individual permit from EPA; however, it will require a DNR permit, and it will need to meet all of our city's regulatory standards as it relates to storm water. Those are items that generally will be handled as a part of the final platting stage and the submission of construction plans. So we are looking at an initial layout of this development at this point with this project, and as the motion stands at this point and your discussion has commenced around that motion, we would be comfortable to tell you that you are making the step in the right direction to address the existing background issues that are here, and we have additional regulatory requirements that lie in front of this development that will ensure that the other environmental related matters that have yet to have been addressed will be taken care of prior to final platting and permitting.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional discussion on this motion? As I see none. May we have a roll call, please, Ms. Secretary?

MS. BURNS: Yes.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodman. Voting No: Ms. Rushing, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann. Motion carries 6-3.**

MS. BURNS: We have six to three, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. The motion -- our recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council. At this time -- Mr. Zenner? At this time we are going to take a quick break and let the room clear out. And we'll come back in seven minutes.

(Off the record.)

MR. STRODTMAN: I'd like to go ahead and we'll call back the December 8th -- Thursday -- 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission regular meeting back to order. And we will pick up where we left off. Still in the Subdivisions, Case 17-13.