

Canton Estates

2 messages

hillrst@aol.com <hillrst@aol.com>

Fri, Apr 2, 2021 at 10:55 AM

Reply-To: hillrst@aol.com

To: "rachel.bacon@como.gov" <rachel.bacon@como.gov>

Rachel,

Please forward this to the Planning and Zoning Commissioners. Thanks for your efforts on my behalf.

Rob Hill

 **MX-2600N_20210402_104800.pdf**
259K

Rachel Smith <rachel.bacon@como.gov>

Fri, Apr 2, 2021 at 11:21 AM

To: hillrst@aol.com

Hi Rob,

I want to confirm receipt of your email. Your comments will go to the Planning and Zoning Commission; comments are thereafter provided to the City Council.

Rachel

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Rachel Smith, AICP, Senior Planner
City of Columbia - Community Development Department
701 E. Broadway
Columbia, MO 65201
[\(573\) 874-7682](tel:(573)874-7682)

4/1/21

Planning and Zoning Commissioners,

I am a member of Friends of Rockbridge and currently live next to Rock Bridge State Park. Responsible and considerate development is important to me. I have spent a lot of time on the design of this development in order to protect the park. Original designs for this land consisted of more than two hundred, 60 foot lots as well as multifamily housing. While this would have been more lucrative, I rejected that plan and designed one that I believe to be reasonable, considerate, and protective of the park.

The first thing I did was significantly reduced the density on the whole tract. I felt like the 60 foot lots and multifamily housing was too dense for this area. The houses in the East Bearfield subdivision are almost all 80 feet wide so I wanted to make sure our lots were consistent and would fit in with theirs'. At Canton we have no lots smaller than 80 feet. Increasing the lot sizes and eliminating the multifamily housing reduced the density by over 50 percent. We have 113 lots on 65 acres. Dividing the number of lots by the acreage indicates a density of 1.74. Clearly, this is not a high density development.

I paid a lot of attention to the storm water management on this site. Please note that the preliminary plan submitted complies to any and all of the city regulations for storm water management. This in itself should be sufficient to ensure the park is protected from storm water runoff. It is sufficient everywhere else in the City of Columbia including neighboring developments. I am concerned that the rules and regulations are adequate and appropriate unless there are people lobbying against a development. I do not believe this is appropriate. I believe the storm water rules and regulations should be applied equally to every development. If a developer wants to add additional protections that should be his or her prerogative.

At Canton Estates, I chose to add extra protections because it matters to me. Looking at the attached layout, you will note three different sections. Each section drains a different direction. The first 28.47 acres on the North side and right off of Gans road, drains to the north into a 2.37 acre pond. This is the opposite direction of the park and towards Gans. This area comprises 54 percent of the lots (61 of the 113). As such, more than half of the development's storm water runoff cannot affect the park. The middle tract has approximately 37 lots on 17.77 acres. This land drains west toward Bearfield Road into a 1.79 acre detention pond. This water will then drain into another pond on the Stewart land as is currently does. The third area, closest to the park, consists of 15 lots on 22.38 acres. This is the only area that drains directly toward the park. This is where I decided to add extra protections. I reduced the density of this area to .67 houses per acre which equates to one house per every acre and a half. We put estate lots ranging in size from 1-1.76 acres on the south side of the road. Finally, behind these estate lots is a 7.22 acre buffer to the park.

Previously, Bill Bryan the former Missouri State Park Director, indicated in order to protect the state parks he wanted to set a precedent with a 50 foot buffer between development and the state park. In order to provide additional protection, Canton Estates will provide a buffer ranging from 150 to 400 feet across the entire State Park boundary. Every lot but one has at least a 200 foot buffer between the property line and the park. Furthermore, some of estate lots are 400 to 500 feet deep. This will likely provide an additional 200-300 feet buffer to the park. I believe this is more than reasonable, considerate, and respectful of the park.

I know I have opposition from the other Friends of Rockbridge and the Sierra Club. They refer to this as "high density" development and have an online petition against this development. They have a great network and have shared their message statewide to garner support their petition. I respect their efforts and their passion, but I believe if you are petitioning, you should be factual in your disclosures. Otherwise, people are agreeing to support suppositions that are false. The claim that this is a high density development is false and they do not disclose that the majority of the storm water will not go towards the park. I have met with Jan Weaver of the Sierra Club and Kevin Roberson from Friends of Rockbridge. They both complimented me on the buffer to the park and the estate lots near the park. They were not completely satisfied though as they are seeking 15 percent impervious surface for the entire development. I am struck that lobbying for increased storm water management is entirely based on an "if this happens" or "this could possibly happen" scenario. The city regulations are designed to prevent the "if's" whether it be for storm water management, or other perils such as fire protection. I don't recall any incidents where fire protection regulations were all met and a development was held up for what could possibly happen. As such, it makes no sense to me that this development or others would be held up due to storm water management concerns despite meeting all of the city rules and regulations. I would certainly hope that the extra protections I have provided for the portion of land that drains toward the Rock Bridge State Park would be more than sufficient to garner your support of this development.

Regarding annexation, Canton Estates fits in the City of Columbia. This lot is contiguous with a city lot owned by the Diocese from the Phillips Tracts right across Gans. Additionally, the Bristol Lake residential subdivision is within the city and is located across Gans right next to Canton Estates. On the south side of Gans and literally one parcel away is a City of Columbia's 293 acre Gans Creek Recreation Area. I can't imagine being one parcel from this City of Columbia Park and not being allowed to be part of the city. I think it's great that the Canton Estate residents could walk to either the City Park or the State Park.

Economically, a shortage of lots and homes available for sale in the Columbia market has been well documented. There is a strong demand for housing in this location. We believe this development will reduce some of that pressure resulting in lower prices for some home buyers. It also provides jobs for all of the trades involved in home building/real estate and will generate millions of dollars in building materials being sold.

Lastly, I would want you to know that I have spent many hours meeting with the neighbors. I have met in their homes, in their yards, at a restaurant and in a neighborhood meeting with Friends of Rock Bridge and the Sierra Club. I still have some neighbors to get to. Generally, I have clarified misinformation such as there will be 300+ lots and spent a lot of time showing the added protections I chose to make for the park. I have met with opposition at times with some neighbors indicating they don't want more people in their park while others have indicated they don't want more people using "their road." The property most effected would be the Clark property which is surrounded by Canton Estates on three sides. I have spoken on the phone with Mr. Clark three times and have met with him in person for two hours. Despite the pleas from some of his neighbors, he is not opposed to the development. The owners of the large parcel to west, between Canton Estates and the City Park, are also supportive of the development. I believe Brock Bukowsky will be submitting a letter of support shortly. There has been speculation that the Diocese will put a school on the land to the north of Canton Estates. While I do not know if this is true or not, I believe it would be nice if kids could potentially walk to school.

After speaking with the neighbors, I have made several concessions. I agreed to move the road that connects to Bearfield 50 feet per the request of Tom Stewart who owns the land across Bearfield. I also agreed to provide some landscape screening to his rental property. Lastly, many of the neighbors have requested that the sidewalk running parallel to Bearfield towards the southwest corner be put behind some of the trees. They wanted to preserve the trees and the scenic look near the park. I am requesting this on their behalf but am willing to put the sidewalk in either way as I know the request does not meet the city code.

In conclusion, there is a strong demand for housing in this location. We have a well established residential development within the city right across the street and a city park one parcel away. This plan meets all city rules and regulations including storm water management. I hope you can see that most of this development does not drain towards the park and that extra protections were put in place for the area that does drain to the park. Collectively, this may not appease the vocal opposition but it clearly exceeds the city requirements and provides additional protection for the park. I appreciate your consideration and am asking for your support of Canton Estates.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rob Hill". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Rob Hill

