



Sheela Amin <sheela.amin@como.gov>

[CityClerk]: Proposed UDC

1 message

Randy Gray <RandyG@missouriautoauction.com>

Fri, Mar 3, 2017 at 6:38 AM

To: "mayor@CoMo.gov" <mayor@como.gov>, "ward1@como.gov" <ward1@como.gov>, "ward2@como.gov" <ward2@como.gov>, "ward3@como.gov" <ward3@como.gov>, "ward4@como.gov" <ward4@como.gov>, "ward5@como.gov" <ward5@como.gov>, "gov," <ward6@como.gov>
Cc: "cityclerk@como.gov" <cityclerk@como.gov>

As a Columbia resident, I have some concerns with the proposed UDC.

The current language related to downtown calls for a minimum 2-story and maximum 10-story height limits throughout the entire downtown.

I ask that you use the "customized" recommendations found on page 23 of the "Downtown Charrette Report", which stated,

https://www.como.gov/wp-content/uploads/COMO_FinalReport_Standard.pdf

DISTRICT CHARACTER RECOMMENDATIONS HEIGHT:

•

a 2 story minimum and 8 story maximum on Broadway Street, a 2 story minimum and 5 story maximum on Walnut and within the neighborhood, and a 3 story

minimum and 10 story maximum on Elm Street

The North Village Arts District and the adjacent North Central Neighborhood should not have a 10-story maximum all the way to Rogers Street. Such a blanket provision would result in a negative impact on the character and identity of this distinct area.

Please make this change at your Monday Council meeting. Thanks,

Randy Gray

301 Edgewood

Columbia, 65203



Sheela Amin <sheela.amin@como.gov>

[CityClerk]: Reject Amendment 18 - UDO comment

1 message

Andy Waters <awaters36@gmail.com>

Sun, Mar 5, 2017 at 12:54 PM

To: CityClerk@como.gov

Cc: mayor@como.gov, ward1@como.gov, ward2@como.gov, ward3@como.gov, ward4@como.gov, ward5@como.gov, ward6@como.gov

Dear Columbia City Council members,

I ask that you **reject** Amendment No. 18, which would require two-story buildings on Providence Road north of Broadway.

This issue came up at the P&Z level and received a thorough vetting. Staff recommended, and P&Z approved, recharacterizing the stretch of Providence Road north of Broadway as Urban General-West, which allows one-story structures, in response to public comments regarding the challenges property owners on that stretch of Providence would face meeting the requirements of the Urban General form standard.

To recap, conforming to Urban General standards, particularly the two-story minimum building height, is problematic for several reasons:

1. Most of the lots on that stretch of Providence Road are small and will not accommodate enough parking to make a two-story building financially feasible. There is no adjacent street parking because of the presence of Providence Road.
2. Lots on the east side of Providence are further hampered by utility easements that run along the roadway.
3. Second-story residential along Providence Road is not feasible because of the noise from the busy thoroughfare. Second-story office is not feasible because of the parking restraints.
4. The area is less reliant on pedestrian traffic than areas in the heart of the Urban General downtown core, making the more flexible Urban General-West standards appropriate as pedestrian traffic gradually increases over time.

Many of the lots along Providence Road — one of the most high-profile corridors in the city — are underutilized and unsightly, and we need public policy that encourages, rather than discourages, redevelopment. Requiring a second story where there is no marketplace demand will make projects too risky for developers and their lenders and will chill needed redevelopment where it is sorely needed.

I own property in the subject area at 100 N. Providence Road. That building, which is home to Tucker's Fine Jewelry, is an example of a very tastefully done one-story retail center that is a vast improvement over the what occupied the site before — a dinky one-hour Moto Photo building. If the two-story requirement were in place before the site was redeveloped in 2007, I can tell you it still would be occupied by the Moto Photo building.

I agree that two-story buildings are desirable downtown, but requiring them where there is no marketplace demand will not make them magically appear. They will be too risky to build until the market catches up, perhaps decades from now,

and sites that could have been put to productive use in the meantime with needed, incremental development will remain unattractive and underutilized. When the market does demand two-story structures along Providence Road, they will be built — with or without the requirement.

Amendment No. 18 is well-intentioned but bad public policy. I strongly urge you to reject it.

Thank you,

Andy Waters

(573) 875-5555

awaters36@gmail.com