

**AGENDA REPORT
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
June 10, 2021**

SUMMARY

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of Boone Development, Inc., Old Hawthorne Development, LLC and Vistas at Old Hawthorne Homes Association (owners), for approval of a 168-lot preliminary plat and design adjustments from Sections 29-5.1(c)(3)(ii) regarding block length, 29-5.1(c)(3)(i)(F) regarding cul-de-sac length, and 29-5.1(f)(2)(iii) regarding driveways on collector streets. The 125.57-acre site includes two parcels located on the south side of Richland Road, approximately 4,000 feet east of Rolling Hills Road that are pending annexation and permanent zoning to R-1 (Case # 106-2021) and three existing City lots located along the north side of Ivory Ln and Crooked Switch Court of which two are proposed to be rezoned to R-1 (Case # 107-2021). (**Case #105-2021**)

DISCUSSION

The applicant is seeking approval of a 169-lot preliminary plat on approximately 126 acres of land that is proposed to be zoned upon annexation to R-1 (Case #106-2021). The entire site includes the area to be annexed, which is 123.84 acres split between two parcels. It also includes three lots currently within the City and generally within the Old Hawthorne development to the south, which are from west to east: Lot C2 of *Vistas at Old Hawthorne Plat 1*, Lot C1 of *Old Hawthorne Plat No. 9*, and Lot 516 of *Old Hawthorne Plat 5* which are south to be rezoned from PD and R-1 to R-1 (Case #107-2021).

The site is mostly vacant, with the exception of a single-family dwelling and a number of accessory structures. Several small ponds are located on the property as well.

The site will provide a total of 169 lots, with 159 lots for single-family dwellings and ten common lots. A number of the residential lots being proposed are larger than one acre and are generally located in the southern portion of the site. The remaining lots are generally larger than the minimum lot width for the R-1 district with the majority exceeding 70 feet in lot width. Half of the common lots will accommodate stormwater features, but only one would be accessible from a public street, with the other four only being accessible through access easements along platted lots. The exception is Lot C10, which is at the entrance to the subdivision. It provides a buffer from the arterial roadway for a portion of the lots, and is accessible by public street, making it more likely to be usable by the residents of the subdivision.

Access to the site will be primarily from a new intersection with Richland Road on the north side of the development. Per UDC requirements, a traffic study was submitted to ascertain the impact of the development on the surrounding road infrastructure. The traffic study did not recommend any infrastructure improvements based on the increase in traffic volumes from the future development of the site, principally due to the conclusions that the increase in traffic at surrounding intersections (such as Richland Road and Rolling Hills/Grace Lane) will not cause the intersection to fall below a reasonable service level. While staff does not disagree with these conclusions, it also recognizes that the increase in traffic will have an incremental impact on the ability of the intersections to properly function, and to that end, a development agreement is being discussed with the applicant to assign a portion of the cost of likely future infrastructure upgrades to this specific development.

In addition to the principal entrance on Richland, the site will also connect to an existing stub (Cutters Corner Lane) that exists within the Old Hawthorne development immediately adjacent to the south of this site. A second access point (San Lorenzo Lane) will be stubbed to the Old Hawthorne development

at existing Ivory Lane to provide a third access point for the overall development. This stub was not existing, but is being accomplished by the inclusion and resubdivision of an existing common lot within Old Hawthorne.

Additional stubs are provided along the east and west property lines of the site, providing future connections for new development in either direction. Two of the connections represent a major collector street which is reflected on the Major Roadway Plan. Portrush Drive from the west property line to the roundabout, and Jasper Park Drive from the roundabout going east to the east property line include 66 feet of right of way to accommodate the identified major collector. Residential lots are platted along these collector streets which is not permitted by the UDC; however, the applicant has submitted a design adjustment seeking relief from this requirement that is discussed later in this report.

As mentioned previously, the preliminary plat includes three existing lots that are currently within the City's municipal boundary. These lots are either designated as common lots (C1 and C2), or include a plat note that restricts residential development of the lot. These generally represent a developer restriction, and Council must approve the removal of the restriction. The applicant has stated that when the final plats including these lots were approved it was understood that they were intended to be redeveloped in the future similar to the current proposal.

When staff reviewed the relevant history of the plans, in regards to Lot 516 of *Old Hawthorne Plat 5*, there was no specific mention of that intent in the case file for the final plat or in the meeting minutes of the specific restriction on the lot. It was not shown as a common lot on the preliminary plat initially. But per Note 4 on the final plat, it was to be used as a common area and not for residential use.

Lot C2 of *Vistas at Old Hawthorne Plat 1* and Lot C1 of *Old Hawthorne Plat No. 9* are currently zoned PD, and the rezoning of these lots to R-1 is further discussed in Case #107-2021. But for purposes of this report, it is assumed that the lots will be rezoned to R-1. Similar to Lot 516, there is no clear mention of these common lots, which is not uncommon. Neither staff reports nor meeting minutes indicate that the common lots were intended to be used for residential purposes in the future.

While staff would prefer to see common open space maintained, if there are no objections from the residents that would be most affected, then staff would not oppose the rearrangement of the lots into the new preliminary plat. The overall integration of the common lots makes sense from an efficient development standpoint, as it utilizes the existing roadway frontage by placing new residential lots on the north side of the street. The common lots do currently provide open space, however the benefit of such narrow lots (roughly on average 25-30 feet deep for each) is debatable, and does not represent an open space that would be generally usable by the community.

The common lots do not include trees for the most part, with the exception of the east portion of Lot 516, so they provide little tree preservation. Staff has not received correspondence from any resident in this area objecting to the consolidation of the common lots in the proposed preliminary plat, although at least 3 residents have called seeking the status of the request since the concept for the preliminary plat was submitted.

One point worth noting is that of the three common lots, only one appears to have been transferred to an HOA, which is the typical practice. Staff did raise concerns with the applicant about residents being properly involved in the discussions to eliminate the common lots, and staff stressed that evidence showing residents acknowledgement of the situation would be worthwhile to provide. Regarding the one lot that is owned by an HOA, the applicant verbally confirmed that the HOA voted to proceed with the reconfiguration of the lot as shown on the preliminary plat.

The site is contiguous with a portion of the City's existing municipal boundary along its south property line where it borders the Old Hawthorne development. The site has access to the City of Columbia's sanitary sewer, but will be served by Public Water District 9 and Boone Electric for water and electric.

Design Adjustments

Associated with the proposed division of the property is a request for three design adjustments from UDC provisions, which are discussed below.

Section 29-5.1(c)(3)(ii)

The first design adjustment is to Section 29-5.1(c)(3)(ii), which requires that streets intersect at intervals not exceeding 600 feet. This provision is to ensure that the street network within a subdivision has good connectivity. Shorter blocks are more efficient at moving traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, and shorter block lengths reduce the reliance on one stretch of roadway by providing many alternative routes, which also reduces the wear and tear on any single stretch of roadway. There are four segments within the subdivision that exceed 600 feet, although some of the segments include two streets grouped together which, if a connection between them was provided, would resolve the block length issue.

1. Coppinwood Drive/Melbourne Drive between Capilano Drive and where Coppinwood & Melbourne intersect (~1,110 feet)
2. Fossil Trace Dr/Helsby Dr between Melbourne Dr and east property line
3. Portrush Drive between Cutter Corner Lane and San Lorenzo Lane
4. Jasper Park Drive between Portrush Drive and Tobiano Court (700 feet)

The applicant states that the request is consistent with the comprehensive plan's goals of reducing long-term maintenance costs (p. 145) over time by reducing the amount of pavement that would be necessary to include additional street connections, and that the absence of the connections will not have an adverse impact on the property.

In segments #3 and #4, the adjacent lots to any new street connections would most likely be lots that exceed one acre, and thus requiring compliant intersection intervals could result in blocks that are only 2 lots long, which the applicant has suggested is inefficient. The other two requests, #1 and #2, would affect the smaller lots within the subdivision, and the location of a corresponding connection appears to be straightforward.

Notwithstanding the applicant's justification, the fact remains that the additional street connections are not meant to solely serve the adjacent lots, but to allow for additional vehicular and pedestrian routes to ensure efficient traffic flow throughout the subdivision. It is worth pointing out that for #3, the most likely solution to the block length issue would be to connect the cul-de-sac of Jasper Park Court to Portrush Drive and that Jasper Park Court is the subject of its own design adjustment for cul-de-sac length. Making the connection could potentially eliminate two separate design adjustments, and there do not appear to be significant grade impediments in the area. Segment #4 could likely connect to the north as well for an additional street connection.

As stated in the comprehensive plan, shorter block lengths are a product of sustainable communities, and promote more walkable development. Block length is not specifically discussed in the goals of Columbia Imagined, but it is identified as a component of Sustainable Infrastructure for Livable and Sustainable Communities (p. 69). For these reasons staff does not support the design adjustments to

block lengths.

Section 29-5.1(c)(3)(i)(F): Cul-de-sac length

The second design adjustment is to section 29-5.1(c)(3)(i)(F) for cul-de-sac length. Cul-de-sacs are typically limited to 300 feet in length, but may extend to 750 feet if there is a specific reason such as surrounding topography or environmental features. Jasper Park Court is approximately 700 feet in length, but staff has determined there is not a significant topographic or environmental feature that would justify allowing it to extend to up to the 750-foot maximum in length, so it is limited to 300 feet.

Longer cul-de-sacs are permitted when an area can only be reached by one street, such as along a significant ridge. This circumstance also typically corresponds to environmental features as well, such as significant waterways. Neither of those scenarios are present here. The reasons for limits on cul-de-sac length are the same as the reasons for block lengths - providing better overall connectivity for more efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation. To list a more practical example, mail delivery and solid waste pickup are conducted less effectively on cul-de-sacs, since one trip to the end of the cul-de-sac will always require a return trip down the cul-de-sac. If a through street were present, then services could continue their route without back-tracking.

A likely solution would be to connect Jasper Park Ct either to the south to provide an additional street intersection with Portrush and/or potentially redesigning San Lorenzo to make a connection to the west. Given that a connection appears to be feasible and the comprehensive plan's goals of sustainable infrastructure, staff does not support the design adjustment.

Section 29-5.1(f)(2)(iii)

The third design adjustment request would allow driveways to be constructed along a collector street. Per Section 29-5.1(f)(2)(iii), private residential driveways are prohibited on collector streets unless the Director determines that no alternative access is practicable. It is important to note that the preliminary plat includes sections of streets that are designed as a major collector street. Portrush Drive from the west property line to the roundabout, and Jasper Park Drive from the roundabout going east to the east property line include 66 feet of right of way to accommodate the identified major collector on the City's Major Roadway Plan that is meant to satisfy the requirement for an east/west major collector between Rolling Hills Road and Olivet Road.

However, per the UDC, no lots may have driveway access off of a collector, and both sections of street reflect a lot arrangement that will require driveway access onto those streets. Staff does not support the requested design adjustment. Including driveways on a collector street is not best practice and introduces additional points of traffic conflict that should be avoided on thoroughfares as they make the street more dangerous and decrease the overall efficiency of the roadway. While the collector will not connect to other subdivisions immediately, the collector is intended to extend west to intersect with Rolling Hills Road (arterial) and Hoylake Drive and to the east where it would intersect with another arterial road in the future.

Major Roadway Plan

Per Section 29-5.2(b)(5), the criteria for approval of a plat includes whether it conforms to the UDC, the comprehensive plan and to all other City ordinances and regulations. Per the UDC, the Major Roadway Plan (MRP) is considered a part of the comprehensive plan. Upon review of the preliminary plat, staff have determined that it is not consistent with the MRP. The MRP includes a north/south major collector generally along the west side of the property. The roadway is shown as aligning with Richland Lane to the north, intersecting with Richland Road and continuing north to connect to I-70 Drive SE. At this

time, CATSO has not heard a request to amend the MRP to eliminate the roadway.

As the above stated UDC section is not found within Section 5.1, the applicant cannot seek relief from the requirement through a design adjustment request. Given that the preliminary plat is not consistent with the MRP, staff must recommend denial.

Conclusion

Staff is recommending denial of all the design adjustments, and as a result, will also recommend denial of the preliminary plat since the preliminary plat would need to be revised to address the design adjustments. However, staff is also recommending denial of the preliminary plat because it is not consistent with the MRP. The UDC states that staff may not approve a preliminary plat if it is not consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Options for addressing the inconsistency with the MRP include requesting that CATSO reconsider the location of the specific roadway, and City Council also has the option of approving the preliminary plat as well. If the PZC supports all the design adjustments, it may still recommend denial of the preliminary plat if it finds that it is not consistent with the MRP as well.

As a note, the plat currently includes several street names that must be revised per review by Joint Communication, which will need to be completed prior to the preliminary plat being forwarded to Council.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Denial of the Design Adjustment from **Section 29-5.1(f)(2)(iii)** to allow streets to intersect at intervals greater than 600 feet.
2. Denial of the Design Adjustment from **Section 29-5.1(c)(3)(i)(F)** to allow a cul-de-sac length of greater than 300 feet.
3. Denial of the Design Adjustment from **Section 29-5.1(f)(2)(iii)** to allow residential driveways on a collector street.
4. Denial of the preliminary plat, due to the denial of the design adjustments and its inconsistency with the MRP.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (ATTACHED)

- Locator maps
- Preliminary Plat
- Traffic Impact Study
- Design Adjustment Worksheets
- Final Plats (11/20/2006; 4/16/2007; 2/4/2013)

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Area (acres)	125.57
Topography	Ridgeline runs from northeast of property to south; several drainage channels running east and west
Vegetation/Landscaping	Turf; areas of climax forest trees generally along property lines, along Richland, and along drainage channel flowing west
Watershed/Drainage	Grindstone Creek
Existing structures	Residential structure with accessory structures

HISTORY

Annexation date	Two parcels: NA; Three common lots: 2005
Zoning District	Two parcels: County A-R ; Three common lots: PD, R-1
Land Use Plan designation	Columbia Imagine: Neighborhood; EAP: Residential
Previous Subdivision/Legal Lot Status	Two parcels: Unplatted Three common lots: Lot C2 of Vistas at Old Hawthorne Plat 1, Lot C1 of Old Hawthorne Plat No. 9, and Lot 516 of Old Hawthorne Plat 5

UTILITIES & SERVICES

Sanitary Sewer	City of Columbia
Water	PWSD #9
Fire Protection	BCFD/City of Columbia
Electric	Boone Electric

ACCESS

Richland Road	
Location	Along the north side of property
Major Roadway Plan	Major Arterial; Boone County maintained (100-106-foot ROW required; 50-53 half-width required); Additional right-of-way shown for dedication.
CIP projects	None
Sidewalk	Sidewalks required

Cutters Corner Lane	
Location	Stubs to south side of site
Major Roadway Plan	NA; Local Residential (50-foot ROW required for extension); additional ROW to be dedicated.
CIP projects	None
Sidewalk	Sidewalks required

PARKS & RECREATION

Neighborhood Parks	Partially within Eastport Park service area; also within Park acquisition service area
Trails Plan	Within North Fork Grindstone Trail area
Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan	Pedway proposed along Richland Road

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

All property owners within 200 feet and City-recognized neighborhood associations within 1,000 feet of the boundaries of the subject property were notified of this pending request on May 12, 2021. Forty-three postcards were distributed.

Report prepared by Clint Smith

Approved by Patrick Zenner