

1000 W Nifong Blvd., Bldg. 1 Columbia, Missouri 65203 (573) 447-0292

October 7, 2021

Pat Zenner
Planning Department Manager
City of Columbia
PO Box 6015
Columbia, MO 65205

Dear Mr. Zenner:

On behalf of my clients, William Stricker and Summit Medical Supplies, LLC, I would like to request that the City Council consider granting relief to Section 29-6.4(n)(1)(D) of the Unified Development Code with regards to the proposed rezoning of approximately 65.4 acres of land located off of Gans Road and Bearfield Road. The subject tract of land is also known as the Canton Estates development.

The zoning and preliminary plat of this tract has been previously heard before the P&Z Commission. At that meeting the Commission recommended denial of the proposed zoning to R-1 along with the accompanying preliminary plat. Per the above section of the code, the applicant needs to obtain Council approval should they desire to reapply for like zoning within a period of one year of denial from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

My client desires to reapply for similar zoning on the subject tract. It is my belief that several of the P&Z Commissioners may have voted against the zoning due to the subdivision layout and configuration of the proposed development and not necessarily due to the zoning. Since that denial at P&Z, we have reconfigured the layout, added substantially more undisturbed areas and greatly reduced the density of the development up against the Rock Bridge State Park.

Specifically, the original preliminary plat contained 113 residential lots. These lots were typically 85-foot wide lots with the exception of 8 acreage lots (1.0 acres to 1.8 acres). There was a 7.2 acre common lot along the south property line that acted as a buffer to Rock Bridge State Park. While there were open greenspaces, much of the site was utilized for development purposes.

The proposed development changes the number of the lots, the location of the development, and the effect on Rock Bridge State Park. The new proposal consists of 99 residential lots and a neighborhood commercial tract. The size of the lots has been reduced in width from a typical 85-foot wide lot to a typical 60-foot wide lot. This allows for the density of the development to be shifted away from Rock Bridge State Park so as to create a development that would not discharge any storm water south directly into the park itself. The change in lot sizes would also lend to smaller homes being built on this site as opposed to what was originally being proposed.

We have also created 3 large acreage tracts of approximately 12 acres in size each for a total of about 36 acres. These large tracts would buffer the development up against the park. Furthermore, we would add a preservation easement to these lots that would protect the existing trees and vegetation on the vast majority of the area of these lots. This easement would protect approximately 32 acres of land up against Rock Bridge State Park. This is approximately 50% of the entire development being preserved in a preservation easement.

After hearing neighbors' concerns about the Rock Bridge State Park and having further discussion with City officials, we believe that the new proposal may be more in line with what has been discussed at previous meetings. If is for the reasons mentioned above that we believe that the development is substantially different than originally proposed.

While I understand that the code states like zonings need to wait a year before reapplying (unless Council approves otherwise), we believe the intent of the regulation is more for like developments than like zonings in many instances. We listened to the neighbors, concerned citizens, and P&Z Commissioners when we formulated a revised plan. We believe that this plan is more in line with what may be acceptable to the Commission and ultimately the City Council. While we are hoping this is the case, we need the R-1 zoning designation in order to allow the revised plan to move forward for consideration.

We respectfully request that the City Council allow for the resubmission of the Canton Estates Preliminary Plat and its accompanying request for R-1 and M-N zoning. We believe that the intent of the development that is being proposed is substantially different than what was previously heard and therefore should be allowed to be considered by the City.

Please review this letter and let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Crockett Engineering Consultants, LLC

Tim Crockett, PE