



Clinton Smith &lt;clinton.smith@como.gov&gt;

---

## Westbury

---

**Baskett Lanelle** <lbaskett@gmail.com>  
To: clinton.smith@como.gov

Tue, Dec 4, 2018 at 12:10 PM

Unfortunately something happened to my first email. Here is a resend. So sorry.

I am writing to voice my apprehension regarding the proposal for the Westbury Development based on the conflicting and misleading information that has been presented to date. In order for the nearby residents to come to a consensus, and potentially lend support to this proposal, the developers need to provide those involved with this proposal with factual information. I also want to express my displeasure with the current proposal as it will create an undesired thoroughfare within the neighborhood, greatly altering the current atmosphere of this residential area. As your constituent, I am seeking your assistance in rejecting this current proposal until written information which conveys factual information regarding the proposed design plans and the parameters for businesses within the development is provided.

I have attended every meeting regarding the Westbury Development and have received contradictory information throughout this process. These meetings, while intended to be informative, have presented conflicting information that is of concern to me and my neighbors. In the meeting at Shakespeare's pizza, a neighbor and I spoke with Mr. McGee's engineer. We were told verbally, and shown on a rendering, that the proposed buffer along Stone Valley would be offset 50 feet. We were also informed that the apartments would be for individuals age 55 and older. During that same meeting, another neighbor spoke directly with Travis McGee. She was informed that the apartments would be for individuals age 21 and above. This conflicting information is concerning as it leaves an impression of disorganization, and potential deceit. This discrepancy would result in two very different demographics for the area and, to date, the residents are unclear of what is being proposed in this area. Shortly after, in the meeting conducted at the Christian Fellowship Church, Mr. McGee stated that the buffer being offset 50' was a "typo" and stated that the buffer was actually offset 25 feet. Given that this information was printed on a previous rendering and stated verbally, I am concerned about the number of other "typos" that will be disclosed. Given that the dimensions were disclosed in numerous modalities, and preferred by the residents, I believe that Mr. McGee needs to honor his word and retain the 50 foot offset buffer that was originally proposed.

Despite the conflicting information that has been presented, I want to convey my concerns regarding some specific components of the proposal and elicit your support in seeking other options. First of all, the proposed street that will enter Stone Valley Parkway at Glenn Wesley has the potential to cause a substantial traffic problem on Stone Valley. I am concerned that people will exit Scott Blvd., drive through the development, and exit on Stone Valley at Glenn Wesley in order to avoid the Smith-Scott Blvd. intersection. This would impact the noise exposure and the safety of the residents who routinely walk within the neighborhood. If there absolutely has to be a street, I would propose that it be offset and exit where there is an island with a right turn on Stone Valley. This would at least allow those of us living on the cul-de-sacs to have the benefit of the buffer which is an important factor. Another possibility would be a pedestrian/bicycle path that is offset to enter Stone Valley where there is an island, rather than a cul-de-sac. Although to you the street is just a line on the map, it is very important to those of us living on Glenn Wesley Court. To us, the proposed street equates to the demise of our safe, quiet, secluded neighborhood. Furthermore, traffic is an issue presently on Smith Street with the Breckenridge Development and Louisville intersecting with Smith. Breckenridge is not nearly completed at this time so additional traffic is a given. Supporting the Westbury Development will further contribute to the difficulties that current residents already have with traffic in this area.

Second, the proposed developments are disconcerting, as the residents do not see a valid need for the businesses being discussed. Most everything that Mr. McGee has proposed for the commercial development is available in multiples within less than two miles in one or both directions from the neighborhood. We currently have easy access to gas stations, pharmacies, medical services, banks, and groceries. There are vacancies at Kelly's Ridge and Kelly's Highland, two large apartment complexes nearby. As such, is there truly a need for additional apartments or any of this proposed development right in the middle of this residential neighborhood? If not, a duplication of services will contribute to the likelihood of empty commercial space and an economic depression in the area.

Additionally, the requested rezoning is very unsettling. It is my understanding that the new zoning would allow Mr. McGee to make changes to his original proposal at will. For example, he could decide not to complete the proposed assisted living facility, and build additional apartments instead. The possibility of an unrestrained bait-and-switch that could lead to multiple undesired developments is causing apprehension with me and my neighbors. I am asking that you deny the rezoning efforts and support the City of Columbia by allowing the city to maintain control over what is included in this development.

It is unfortunate that the planning and zoning hearing is now scheduled for December 20th, when so many of us will be gone for the holidays. Having the hearing on this date is a definite advantage for the developer and a distinct disadvantage for the neighborhoods involved. Based on the information presented above, as your constituent, I am asking if this meeting could be moved to a date in January. This additional time would allow more residents to attend and offer Mr. McGee more time to provide factual information in writing.

As a long-term resident on Glenn Wesley Court, I am asking that you investigate the points mentioned above and evaluate the ramifications of this development.. I hope that you will support our neighborhood by rejecting the requested rezoning and allowing the City of Columbia to maintain control of this development. I do appreciate your time and sincere attention to this important matter.

Lanelle Baskett  
[4713 Glenn Wesley Ct.](#)



Clinton Smith &lt;clinton.smith@como.gov&gt;

---

## Westbury Village

---

**Sandy Hogan** <srhogan@centurytel.net>

Sun, Nov 18, 2018 at 9:16 AM

To: "clinton.smith@como.gov" &lt;clinton.smith@como.gov&gt;

We are very concerned with the high density apartments on the North side of Westbury Village. Single family and/or duplexes would be a much better fit with King's Meadow and the other surrounding neighborhoods. This would also help with traffic congestion and volume. There is already a large apartment complex (Kelley Ridge) a half mile down the road that rents for a much lower monthly amount that is no way near full capacity.

Sandy and Wayne Hogan  
King's Meadow

Sandy and Wayne Hogan  
300 Bright Star Ct.  
Columbia, MO 65203



Clinton Smith &lt;clinton.smith@como.gov&gt;

---

## Westbury Development

---

Schaper, Linda J. CMOVAMC &lt;Linda.Schaper@va.gov&gt;

Thu, Nov 15, 2018 at 1:03 PM

To: "greenbean62000@yahoo.com" &lt;greenbean62000@yahoo.com&gt;

Cc: "clinton.smith@como.gov" &lt;clinton.smith@como.gov&gt;, "ward4@CoMo.gov" &lt;ward4@como.gov&gt;, "wiedmeyerc@missouri.edu" &lt;wiedmeyerc@missouri.edu&gt;

Mr. Smith,

I live on Glenn Wesley Court to the west of the planned development being discussed. My concerns are as follows:

- 1. Traffic:** It has already gotten worse after connecting Louisville from the west and adding another subdivision directly down Smith. Trying to pull out of Stone Valley Parkway onto Smith has become much more difficult (no light and no stop sign) and will be even worse once apartments are added into this residential area. We have been told that a street will connect Scott directly into our cul-de-sac and we will be without ANY buffer and will suffer all the cut through traffic from APARTMENTS.
- 2. Need and Safety:** I've lived on Glenn Wesley Ct for 16 years and have watched MULTIPLE APARTMENTS built on West Broadway. Columbia has no need for more and trouble filling up what we already have.. There is also the matter of Cherry Hill down the road that can't manage to draw businesses and they avoided apartments in their neighborhood and expensive homes were incorporated into that area, not apartments! This 'development' is entirely surrounded by residential neighborhoods and we already have gas stations, grocery stores, banks and a Walmart within 1.5 miles from this 'development.' We were told apartments would go in first and then businesses as needed (unlikely) and we just end up with a bunch of multi-family apartments on the perimeter butting up to all of our neighborhoods with no benefit of a green space and pedestrian uses. WE DO NOT WANT APARTMENTS backed up to within 25 ft of our residential area. Transient housing (and especially if it can't be filled due to lack of need and then lowers it's standards) is **undesirable** and makes our homes **less safe** and **property values to go down**. The **traffic** will be ridiculous adding 270 **more vehicles** along Scott right after a curve (1 **death**) to a light with **multiple accidents** (1 **death**) already.
- 3.** We should not have to maintain a parkway (Stone Valley) by our homeowners dues when the city directs traffic into a residential neighborhood with a street out of an apartment complex right onto it.
- 4. Thoughts:** If this is happening regardless of our concerns AND the fact that it will not benefit Columbia in anyway, it seems that a street from Scott to the west should be off set from any cul-de-sac in our subdivision. It would come out to a median on Stone Valley Parkway and traffic would have to go right instead of left to Smith. Bad thing is people will probably make the right and then U-turn at Glenn Wesley. It would at least give us on Glenn Wesley a small **BUFFER** from the apartments. The drawings all have a set back of 50 feet along the west side but I've been told that is a typo. Wow, that's misleading. We wanted a tree line left but have been told it will all be leveled this summer. What happened to **Columbia** and it's **GREEN SPACE**. I am fully aware a private owner can build what is allowed but am NOT in favor of doing ANY re-zoning that gives MORE than currently allowed multi-family housing. If it is currently zoned for **duplexes** along Stone Valley Parkway, that is **preferable** than APARTMENTS.

Please do not re-zone for additional housing in any form than currently allowed and avoid any street directly into Glenn Wesley Court.

We've also been told no balconies will face west. I found this in the City of Columbia ordinances: No façade of a primary multi-family structure facing an R-1, R-2, or R-MF district or a property containing a one-family attached, detached, or duplex dwelling may contain an exterior balcony or patio.

We will need some sort of light or stop sign in order to get out of our neighborhood at Stone Valley Parkway and Smith as it is already more difficult with additional subdivisions directed there AND adding this development.

Please please consider the implications to surrounding neighborhoods and to the dangerous intersection you are going to create. If our city council members in Ward 4 can't see the lack of benefit to this area, my vote will reflect my dissatisfaction.

Thanks for your time,

Linda Schaper

[4702 Glenn Wesley Court](#)

[Columbia, Missouri](#)

[Greenbean62000@yahoo.com](mailto:Greenbean62000@yahoo.com)

(i)



Clinton Smith &lt;clinton.smith@como.gov&gt;

---

## Westbury Village

---

**Marcella Snakenberg** <marcys1@msn.com>

Fri, Nov 16, 2018 at 4:54 PM

To: "clinton.smith@como.gov" &lt;clinton.smith@como.gov&gt;

Neighbors need to know that they shouldn't fear reduced property values. Look at Broadway Farms. Many of us have realtors trying to locate us housing there, and property values went up when HyVee and Walmart were added. Smithton Ridge and Vintage Falls are the same. Many of us older home owners want to be close to shopping. Realtors use "close to shopping" as a positive when advertising property. I will be looking to purchase a home in Stoneridge if Westbury is built. I am in favor of the development.

Marcella Snakenberg  
5001 Daphine Ct  
Columbia, MO. 65203

Sent from my iPad



Clinton Smith &lt;clinton.smith@como.gov&gt;

---

## Case #24-2019 Westbury Village Map Amendment

---

**Rebecca Ashbaugh** <rgashbaugh@gmail.com>  
To: Clinton Smith <Clinton.Smith@como.gov>

Mon, Dec 17, 2018 at 5:35 AM

To City of Columbia and Mr Smith,

My property opens onto the lot north of the proposed Faurot Dr. It has been proposed to build a three story apartment complex on this lot. I'm very much against this proposal. The traffic congestion is one problem it will undoubtedly create. Another is the idea that this area needs another mini shopping mall. There are many examples, near here and around Columbia where the empty buildings sit, even after the many attempts to thrive from venturing businesses. I see this as another attempt from a developer to make his money, leaving us with an unsuccessful, empty building monster to look at, not to mention the empty apartment buildings all around Columbia that are still trying to fill. This area has become so over populated as it is, the City should try another idea for this field. Try another beautiful park for all the people who live near.

Once a shopping mall is built, especially in this neighborhood, it will be standing here for a very long time. Look at Cherry Hill, it has never really taken off. And do we really need a bank and store on every corner?

Please consider some alternative ideas to buildings. We need areas where rain water can replenish our water table. We need beautiful areas throughout our city. Please do not build this Westbury Village.

A very concerned property owner,  
Rebecca Ashbaugh  
4316 Christian Fellowship Rd  
Columbia, MO

[Quoted text hidden]



Clinton Smith &lt;clinton.smith@como.gov&gt;

---

## Westbury planned development

---

**Debby Jones** <debby06j@gmail.com>  
To: Clinton.Smith@como.gov

Sat, Dec 15, 2018 at 4:52 PM

I live w my husband in Kings Meadows. We are concerned about the apts. planned. Could a berm be put in on the north side to shield our subdivision. We do not want student housing apts but more professional level apts. to match the surrounding areas. We do like the new street coming from Dayspring Dr. over to Smith Dr. to give the school better access. That could cut down traffic on Christian Fellowship Dr. to and from the school. Another request is that no businesses unsuitable for a school and family neighborhood be allowed to be set up in the area. This is impt for our children and young people. No vapor stores, liquor stores, etc. Also if a grocery store is planned we ask it not be a huge store. Thank you for considering these requests. Mr. and Mrs. Jones. 4305 Christian Fellowship Rd.





Clinton Smith &lt;clinton.smith@como.gov&gt;

---

**Re: Opposed to Westbury Village Development**

---

**Hien Nguyen** <hnguyen97@gmail.com>  
To: Clinton.Smith@como.gov

Sat, Dec 15, 2018 at 7:12 PM

Mr. Smith,

My name is Hien Nguyen and I am a resident of the Rothwell Heights Neighborhood. My address is [4112 Defoe Dr, Columbia MO 65203](#). I am writing to say that I am opposed to the proposed zoning changes for the Westbury Village development.

My first concern is that the developer is showing residents a plan, but if they obtain the new zoning, they do not have to follow the plan and can do anything which is allowed under the open zoning provisions of the code. As residents, we will have no idea what will be placed right next to our neighborhood and will have no ability to give our input.

Also, the developer is talking a lot about his and the city's objective of making walkability a priority. However, his plans and what he has communicated show that there will be multiple drive-throughs, a convenience store which is open 24/7 and a pharmacy with a drive-through--none of which encourage walkability.

Added to this issue is the multiple lanes of fast traffic which we would need to attempt to cross to walk to the development.

The 24 hour convenience store the developer plans is a key concern for me, as well as a 24 hour pharmacy.

The lighting will be visible to homes in Rothwell Heights, there will be increased traffic and foot traffic, and there are some environmental concerns of being near gas stations. Many of these same issues concern me about having multiple fast food restaurants.

There is very little R-2 housing between Rothwell Heights and the development site (a single row of a few duplexes). This proposal has the feel of a commercial development placed in the center of several nice residential neighborhoods. I am concerned also about what such a commercial development will do to our property value. I do not believe the development fits the feel of the surrounding area and I do not believe this location is appropriate for what the developer is proposing.

Thank you,

Hien

---

**Westbury**

---

**Kristin Gadsden** <kcgadsden@gmail.com>  
To: Clinton.Smith@como.gov

Wed, Dec 19, 2018 at 3:25 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Mr. Smith,  
My name is Kristin Gadsden and I am a resident of the Kings Meadow Neighborhood.

I am writing to say that I am opposed to the proposed zoning changes for the Westbury Village development. My first concern is that the developer is showing residents a plan, but if they obtain the new zoning, they do not have to follow the plan and can do anything which is allowed under the open zoning provisions of the code. As residents, we will have no idea what will be placed right next to our neighborhood and will have no ability to give our input.

Also, the developer is talking a lot about his and the city's objective of making walkability a priority. However, his plans and what he has communicated show that there will be multiple drive-throughs, a convenience store which is open 24/7 and a pharmacy with a drive-through-- none of which encourage walkability. Added to this issue is the multiple lanes of fast traffic which we would need to attempt to cross to walk to the development.

The 24 hour convenience store the developer plans is a key concern for me, as well as a 24 hour pharmacy. The lighting will be visible to homes in Kings Meadow, there will be increased traffic and foot traffic, and there are some environmental concerns of being near gas stations. Many of these same

issues concern me about having multiple fast food restaurants.

This proposal has the feel of a commercial development placed in the center of several nice residential neighborhoods. I am concerned also about what such a commercial development will do to our property value. I do not believe the development fits the feel of the surrounding area and I do not believe this location is appropriate for what the developer is proposing.

Thank you for your time and concern,

Kristin Gadsden



Travis McGee  
THM Construction, LLC  
308 S. 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 101-M  
Columbia, Missouri 65201

December 19, 2018

To: City of Columbia Planning Department  
City of Columbia Planning & Zoning Commission  
C/o Pat Zenner  
C/o Clinton Smith  
701 E. Broadway  
Columbia, Missouri 65205

RE: RESPONSE TO STAFF REPORT: An Alternative Point of View

Dear Mr. Zenner, Mr. Smith and members of the Planning & Zoning Commission,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the staff report that accompanies the application to rezone 45.14 acres of property located at the northwest and southwest corner of Scott Boulevard and Smith Drive from PD (Planned Development) zoning to 3.31 acres of M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood), 21.53 acres of M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor), and 20.3 acres to R-MF (Multiple-family Dwelling) zoning. **(Case #24-2019)**

We believe that the staff report represents a thorough review of the facts and conditions that currently exist in relation to this request, but we respectfully disagree with some of the conclusions drawn from the information presented.

This application for rezoning was presented after significant discussion and modification to meet the standards, restrictions and permissions expressed in the current UDC and to establish a reasonable blueprint for land use and development in this location.

As has been pointed out in the accompanying staff report, this request complies with the intent and specific description of this area in the Comprehensive Plan and is well-placed in terms of its location to provide new commercial retail and residential opportunities in a manner that is consistent with the city's stated objective of providing mixed-use development in the city along major roads and thoroughfares throughout the community. This project is not on the scale of the Columbia Mall, as is alluded to in the original report; is not a regional shopping center in terms of scale or intended use; and balances the use of the land under consideration nearly equally between commercial and residential

uses – something that is not evident in larger scale developments like the Columbia Mall, Parkade Plaza, or The Shoppes on Stadium.

It is truly a plan that pursues the concept of mixed-use, which was clearly the intent of policy makers when the new UDC was adopted. Even the titles of the new zoning categories reflect that intent. We no longer refer to commercial zoning designations as C-1, C-2, or C-3, but rather adopt a more descriptive, and to some extent proscriptive, set of descriptions titled Mixed Use – Neighborhood, Mixed Use – Corridor, Mixed Use – Downtown, etc. Although the blending of residential and commercial uses can be challenging on some levels, this plan strikes an appropriate balance and does so under the restrictions and permissions granted in the new code. Our plan also requests placement of uses in logical locations in relationship to one another and to the existing road infrastructure. Commercial uses are located along Scott Boulevard, Smith Drive and on the interior portion of the development where residential development would be less desirable. Residential uses are designed to step down the intensity of use as it meets up with single family homes. The most intensive use in the area is Scott Boulevard itself, and that is not something that we can control except to modify it for safe and efficient movement of traffic as it relates to our site and to make it more appealing in terms of appearance as prescribed by the current UDC landscaping and buffering requirements. Our proposal provides for those improvements.

This proposal reflects the continued development of this area by the city in terms of infrastructure and development patterns authorized by the city. Although there are existing residential communities in close proximity to the new project, we have made significant efforts to provide buffering and some level of separation from incompatible uses while adhering to the concept of mixed-use that is encouraged by current land use policy. The major point of contention at this point seems to be what we propose to do along the Scott Boulevard corridor. From our point of view, this is a major city thoroughfare. It is a high-volume corridor which the code itself specifies is a suitable location for Mixed Use – Corridor types of businesses, and should be able to take advantage of that existing traffic to help make this project successful. The impact of those uses is minimized by careful planning and the general step-down of intensity in uses as is evident by our use of 20 acres of this area for multi-family residential use. The existing residential structures that currently exist along Scott Boulevard will not be negatively impacted by this new proposal. In fact, their main nuisance is most likely the road itself. In short, MC zoning along Scott Boulevard is more logical than the existence of residential property along that same frontage.

It should be noted that this proposal does not request any variances, design modifications or unusual interpretations of the code or Comprehensive Plan to achieve compliance with the new UDC. In so doing, this proposal has been required to comply with stormwater, buffering, setback, building height, lighting restrictions, parking, landscaping, stream protection and neighborhood protections that are more stringent than previous versions of the zoning code or some elements of Planned development agreements approved in the past. While it does propose some changes from previous plans, it maintains the underlying commercial and residential intent of the land use previously granted, and brings the entire project into compliance with the more modern, more restrictive code.

During the process of adopting the new UDC it was repeatedly pointed out that Planned Zoning, while appropriate in some cases, is a cumbersome and imperfect tool for making general land use decisions; is difficult to enforce and administer; and often leads to confusion for buyers, builders and residents over time. We have tried to avoid that circumstance by trying to make this proposal reflect the new zoning categories that were defined and adhering to the restrictions outlined in that code without exception. In fact, because this is a transitional time in the history and implementation of this code, we provided a more detailed land use plan than would ordinarily be required; provided suggested uses for many of the

lots included in this proposal; created artist renderings to give neighbors and policy makers some sense of the scale, potential and intended use and design of the entire project; and engaged in outreach efforts that are over and above what would typically be required for a project such as this.

We have sponsored public information meetings of our own; attended public information meetings hosted by the city and policy makers; have held discussions with neighborhood groups and individuals; have contacted more than 1,800 residents in the vicinity about our plan; created a website with information that is easily accessed by any interested party and have tried to be responsive to demands from the city regarding improvements to infrastructure and other financial concerns. We have completed a Traffic Analysis for the surrounding area to help guide in the decision-making process. In fact, when the Development Agreement was being negotiated with the city, the city used the more intensive M-C designation and proposed uses along with that traffic plan to determine what level of investment would be required from this development, and that level of use at that time seemed to be acceptable to city staff.

We are asking for approval of a reasonable set of land uses for a parcel of land for which such general uses were deemed acceptable nearly 20 years ago. We would prefer to present this plan as originally presented, including the M-C use designations requested. We would be open to a modification of the requirement to construct a full-service road from Faurot Drive to Stone Valley Parkway, but have submitted this request showing the full road in accordance with the terms of the current UDC. Removal of the requirement to construct that road is at the discretion of the Columbia City Council and could be supported, opposed or commented on by the Planning & Zoning Commission.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'T. McGee', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Travis McGee  
Owner, THM Construction, LLC

---

## Concerns about Westbury Development

1 message

---

**Jeremy Brown** <eljefebrown@gmail.com>  
To: clinton.smith@como.gov

Thu, Dec 20, 2018 at 11:37 AM

Hi Clint,

I know we've emailed before about Westbury, but I wanted to officially send you my concerns for the record, since I can't attend the hearing tonight due to a work event.

Thanks,  
Jeremy

-----

As a concerned resident of the Rothwell Heights Neighborhood in Columbia, and a member of the Rothwell neighborhood association board, I am writing to say that I am opposed to the proposed zoning changes for the Westbury Village development. My first concern is that the developer is showing residents a plan, but if they obtain the new zoning, they do not have to follow the plan and can do anything which is allowed under the open zoning provisions of the code. As residents, we will have no idea what will be placed right next to our neighborhood and will have no ability to give our input.

Also, the developer is talking a lot about his and the city's objective of making walkability a priority. However, his plans and what he has communicated show that there will be multiple drive-throughs, a convenience store which is open 24/7, and a pharmacy with a drive-through--none of which encourage walkability. Added to this issue is the multiple lanes of fast traffic which we would need to attempt to cross to walk to the development. The 24 hour convenience store the developer plans is a key concern for me, as well as the 24 hour pharmacy.

Additionally, the lighting will be visible to homes in Rothwell Heights, there will be increased traffic and foot traffic, and there are serious environmental concerns of living near gas stations. Many of these same issues concern me about having multiple fast food restaurants. There is very little R-2 housing between Rothwell Heights and the development site (a single row of a few duplexes).

This proposal has the feel of a commercial development placed in the center of several nice residential neighborhoods, rather than a true mixed-use, walkable shopping center that might actually benefit the neighborhood. I am concerned also about what such a commercial development will do to the property values of all the surrounding neighborhoods, including Rothwell Heights. I do not believe the development fits the feel of the surrounding area and I do not believe this location is appropriate for what the developer is proposing.

Please reject the developer's proposal for rezoning.

Sincerely,  
Jeremy Brown  
4102 N. Wappel Dr.

--

---

## Westbury Village Zoning Map Amendment (Case #18-181)

---

**Stewart Johnson** <SJohnson@cpsk12.org>  
To: "clinton.smith@como.gov" <clinton.smith@como.gov>  
Cc: "ward4@CoMo.gov" <ward4@como.gov>

Thu, Dec 20, 2018 at 10:04 AM

Mr. Smith,

I am a property owner who is 200 feet or less from the proposed Westbury Village project. As a result, I received a letter informing me of the meeting for this evening. Unfortunately, I have a prior commitment and cannot make the meeting. I would like to let you know that I am VERY concerned about the proposed project. I have been to the informational meetings that the developers put on and I have a major concern about the area. By adding the mixed-use neighborhood, mixed-used corridor and Multiple-family designations to the property at Scott and Smith Drives, you are increasing the amount of traffic in the area and specifically on Smith Drive significantly. In the proposal, the property will only have a right-in and right-out access. All left-in and left-out will be to Smith Drive. That is the only street where there is a street light. On top of that is the new development, Breckenridge being built at the corner of Smith and Louisville. This is going to increase traffic to an amazing level, specifically on Smith Drive. I have seen the traffic studies conducted on behalf of the developers and I do not think it paints an accurate picture of the traffic patterns that will be taking place when the new development of Breckenridge is completed and Westbury Village is completed. Smith Drive will have to handle those new developments and the existing neighborhoods of the area. I do not see relief unless there is an extension of our roads in this area. I know that has been discussed for the future development of that area (extension of Broadway, etc...), but it is not in the plans for this development. I am not against development, but want to make sure that all aspects of a development are considered. As a concerned citizen and a homeowner who lives 200 feet away from the proposed development of Westbury Village, I believe the city should continue to look at the impact to our infrastructure that this development will have in this area of Columbia. Please let me know if you have any questions. I have Cced Ian Thomas, the Ward 4 city council member.

Sincerely,

Stewart Johnson



----- Forwarded message -----

From: <[noreply@gocolumbiamo.com](mailto:noreply@gocolumbiamo.com)>

Date: Wed, Dec 26, 2018 at 6:06 PM

Subject: [Bldg-Inspection]: City of Columbia Contact Form : 12-26-2018 06:06:03 pm

To: <[bldg-inspection@como.gov](mailto:bldg-inspection@como.gov)>

The following form submission was received on the City of Columbia website. The sender has been notified of the successful receipt of this request. Recipients should respond to this request within a reasonable time frame, normally within 1 to 3 business days. For more information regarding origin of this message or to report spam contact the Webmaster at [webmaster@como.gov](mailto:webmaster@como.gov)

Below are the results of a Web form submitted on: December 26th, 2018 at 06:06PM (CST).

Name: Edyth Jenkins

Email Address: [edythjenkins@gmail.com](mailto:edythjenkins@gmail.com)

Comments: I would like to ask the city of Columbia's support for the planning and zoning decision to deny the developer of the Westbury property on Scott Blvd,his request for rezoning. If he had his way, he would be allowing a gas station on the corner and fast food restaurants as well. The surrounding neighborhoods have spoken strongly against his proposals for these kinds of buildings. Many neighbors will likely move away if this happens. I have already seen 4 new for sale signs on surrounding properties the past several weeks.

Edyth Jenkins

[4804 Samantha Ct](#)

Stoneridge Subdivision