



701 East Broadway, Columbia, Missouri 65201

Department Source: Community Development - Planning

To: City Council

From: City Manager & Staff

Council Meeting Date: January 5, 2026

Re: Western Portion of Tract 5 of Richland Road Annexation – PD Plan/Preliminary Plat, site-specific Statement of Intent, and Development Agreement (Case # 231-2025)

Impacted Ward: Ward 3

Executive Summary

This request seeks approval of a PD plan, serving as a preliminary plat, and a site-specific Statement of Intent (SOI) on 24.13 acres of land zoned PD (previously PUD-4) that is part of a 2010 annexation, permanent zoning, and development agreement involving 4-tracts of land south of Richland Road at the intersection of Grace Lane and Rolling Hills Road commonly known as the "Richland Road Annexation". The proposed PD Plan/Preliminary Plat is to be known as, "Ashford Place" and is located directly north of the terminus of Sagemoor Drive at the northern boundary of The Brooks Subdivision Phase 2 and within the western 1/3 of Tract 5 of the Richland Road Annexation parcel.

The PD plan proposes development of 77 single-family attached dwelling units and several additional common lots within the acreage. Additionally, the PD Plan is accompanied by a Development Agreement that addresses developer obligations and contributions associated with the future extension of El Chaparral Avenue as such roadway will traverse the development parcel within its northwest corner.

Discussion

Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Troy Miller Properties LLC (owner), is requesting approval of a site-specific PD Plan/Preliminary Plat and Statement of Intent (SOI) to be known as, "Ashford Place." The 24.13-acre subject site is located directly north of the terminus of Sagemoor Drive, and is currently zoned PD (Planned District). Approval of this request would grant authorization to improve the 24.13-acre tract with 77 single-family attached dwelling units and several additional common areas that will be used for stormwater management and preservation purposes. Additionally, this request seeks approval of a Development Agreement that will establish developer obligations and contributions relating to the future extension of El Chaparral Avenue within the development's boundaries.

Proposal Overview -

The subject site is a portion of Tract 5 of the 2010 "Richland Road Annexation" request which annexed, permanently zoned, and approved a development agreement on 4 development tracts located south of Richland Road at its intersection with Grace Lane and Rolling Hills Road. The approved development agreement contained a Statement of Intent for permissible development within each of the 4 tracts and stipulated certain improvements that were to be made depending on the tracts proposed for development and their intensity of development. At the time of annexation, a planned district zoning entitlement could be granted without the submission of a development plan and no plans were

submitted for the subject acreage. To date, the only development plan approved for any portion of the overall acreage contained within the 2010 annexation/permanent zoning has been that associated with the eastern approximate 1/3 of Tract 5 which is presently improved with The Brooks Subdivision Phase 1.

Statement of Intent Considerations -

An updated and 2017 UDC-compliant version of the required Statement of Intent (SOI) for PD-zoned development has been submitted with this request. This updated SOI provides site-specific clarity with respect to the development of the subject tract by adding information on the type of development proposed and the dimensional/lot standards that would apply as well as clarity on other design parameters such as required parking and open space allotments. The updated and UDC-compliant SOI has not added any use or provisions that were not otherwise authorized in 2010, but rather has provided **clarity** with regards to several “generally” defined provisions intended to be fully “worked-out” at the time of a formal development plan submission with each subsequent site-specific development proposal.

With respect to the proposed development of attached single-family dwellings on the subject site, Section 2, Paragraph (d)(3) of the 2010 approved SOI specifically permitted one-family detached or attached dwellings on Tract 5 and established a maximum number of dwellings within the Tract at 538. Section 2, Paragraph (j) of the 2010 SOI notes that the “plan for Tract 5 is generally described as a plan containing One-Family and One-Family Attached units and any combination of same. Units may be contained **on a single zero lot line lot, a single-family lot, or on a large lot containing several units. In addition, there may be up to 3 units in a single building.**” The attached development plan proposes a maximum of 3 single-family attached dwellings on their own individual lots (Lot A, B, or C) within the boundaries of a larger common lot (Lot D).

The lot configuration shown on the proposed development plan largely drives the need to update and provide clarity within the existing SOI. No minimum lot area standards were established in the 2010 SOI and the only lot dimensional standards specified with Section 2, Paragraph (j) of the 2010 SOI were that each lot would maintain a minimum 20-foot setback from interior streets and there would be a **perimeter** setback consistent with the provisions of the zoning regulations (25-feet in 2010).

Proposed development lots will be designed as ABCD lots, where lots A, B, and C will all contain one single-family attached dwelling unit and be surrounded by a common lot (Lot D). This type of lot arrangement is viewed as being consistent with that permitted within the 2010 SOI for Tract 5 as referenced above. The only matter not clearly called out was the individual lot size and specific lot dimensional standards for each of the lots proposed (i.e. A, B, C, and D). As such, the updating of the 2010 SOI to include the specific standards is seen as essential to ensure that when individual permits are sought from the Building Department an evaluation of compliance or non-compliance can be made.

The updated SOI indicates that individual A, B, and C lots may be as small as 1,500 square feet in area, have no setbacks, and contain structures not exceeding 35-feet in height. It should be noted that proposed PD Plan shows each future A, B, and C lot as being 66-feet

deep by 28-feet wide and surrounded by a common lot (Lot D) containing approximately 12,000 square feet. The variation between the proposed SOI and the PD Plan is not uncommon as it permits a developer the ability to adapt lot sizes to market conditions as a “minor” amendment (an administrative process) versus a full formal rezoning request involving a public hearing. However, it is important to note that any deviation from the final Council approved PD Plan would require submission of an amended PD Plan at which time all SOI and PD Plan specific requirements would be re-evaluated to ensure continued regulatory compliance.

Given Lots A, B, and C are surrounded by a common lot (Lot D) and no setbacks are being proposed for the ABC lots, the general front, side, and rear yard setback requirements that would be typically applied to individual lots have been shifted to the boundaries of Lot D. ‘D’ lots will have a 25-foot front setback between the right-of-way and the beginning of the interior lots (ABC). A side setback of 6-feet will be maintained between the exterior boundary Lot D and exterior boundary of Lots A and C. A 25-foot rear setback between the exterior boundary of Lot D and the interior boundary of lots (ABC) will be maintained.

The proposed setbacks that would be applied to ‘D’ lots between the interior ABC lots is no different than what would otherwise be allowed within a comparable R-1, R-2, or R-MF zoning districts where individual lots each having their own street frontage would be required to comply with. The principal difference between a more traditional single-family residential development and that proposed within Ashford Place is that the ‘D’ lots will be dedicated as a common lot shared by each group of ABC lots and owned by a homeowner association and/or the developer. It should be noted that per the proposed SOI, the front 25-feet of the ‘D’ lots would be used to accommodate at least one of the required on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The second required parking space, per the proposed SOI, would be within an attached 1-car garage within the dwelling.

The absence specific lot dimension and setback standards within the original 2010 SOI was not uncommon. Pursuant to pre-2017 regulatory processes these types of specifics were customarily left out of the zoning entitlement and were to be determined upon submission of a “site-specific” development plan, similar to that **now** being sought, for the subject property. Furthermore, the practice of approving modifications to minimum lot size and/or setback standards from comparable “straight” zoning district’s requirements as part of the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council review process for PD Plans was customary practice pre-2017. Following the adoption of the UDC in March 2017, adjustments to dimensional standards and other zoning requirements are now addressed as a “design exceptions” to ensure that a clear public record has been established authorizing these variations.

As such, staff presented the adjustments sought by the application specific to the Ashford Place PD Plan to the Planning Commission for their consideration as part of the PD Plan approval hearing process and recommended that the variations be addressed like any other “design exception” in accordance with current UDC practices. Staff concluded that the exceptions were appropriate as they were driven by the proposed lot configuration being specifically proposed and the lack of any contrary provisions within the 2010 SOI.

As described above, the proposed ABC lots are fewer than 30 feet in width and contain less than 3,500 square feet of area. These standards are the minimum needed for compliant attached single-family lot within the current UDC. In 2010, when this Tract's development entitlements were approved, attached single-family housing was not defined within the zoning ordinance (former Chapter 29) and the use of the PUD designation was employed to allow for the actual design of the lots to be determined at the time a final development plan was submitted for approval. While the current development plan appears to have area sufficient to allow for the expansion of each individual ABC lot to meet the minimum lot width and likely lot area standards such that compliance with the current attached single-family requirements of the UDC could be met, such a modification would not result in a material change to the infrastructure required on site or the possible unit/acre density on the site.

Open space & Easement Considerations -

The northern portion of this site is largely encumbered by a floodway and a 500-year floodplain within the North Fork Grindstone Creek tributary. There is also a Type-1 stream buffer within the floodway. 25% of the existing climax forest on the site is to remain post-development in accordance with the tree preservation standards outlined in Sec. 29-4.4(C)(1)(i) of the UDC and will be contained within common lot C-3, approximately 7-acres, though not all of the acreage is vegetated with climax forest. Other significant trees to remain largely exist on the southern portion of the site and within the floodplain/way, and are illustrated in the attached tree preservation plan. Trees within the stream buffer may not be counted toward the required 25% preservation, and a tree will be planted for every structure and common lot. Removed significant trees shall be replaced by 3 large - to medium sized deciduous trees in accordance with the provision of the UDC.

Easements accommodating the extension of utilities will be required to be dedicated upon final platting of each development phase. The development plan shows sewer being extended to the rear of each lot and in some cases extended within right-of-way. Storm drains will also be constructed within dedicated easements, leading to a proposed approximate 1-acre detention basin south of the future extension of El Chaparral (i.e. behind lots 7-14). Adequacy of the proposed stormwater facilities will be verified at the time of construction plan approval prior to final platting. All facility design must comply with the City stormwater requirements (Chapter 12A) which stipulate post-development stormwater impacts cannot exceed pre-development conditions.

Transportation-related Considerations -

A significant public concern expressed during the Commission's hearing, in addition to the proposed use of single-family attached dwellings being an inconsistent land use, was how the subject acreage would be accessed. Street access to this site will be through the extensions of Sagemoor Drive and Bethpage Road. These roadways are the only existing points of ingress/egress available to this site at this time. Sagemoor and Bethpage both were platted to the southern border of the subject property pursuant to the requirements of Sec. 29-5.1(C)(i)(H) of the UDC to ensure future access for development of Tract 5.

Internal access to the proposed 77 dwellings will be provided from Sagemoor Drive, Bethpage Loop, Bethpage Road, and Margate Way. Margate Way will stub to the property to the east as required by the UDC, terminating temporarily in an off-site turnaround easement, and will allow the stub to ultimately extend further east as additional development in Tract 5 commences ultimately connecting to Hoylake Drive. The temporary turnaround will be recorded prior to final plat approval for that portion of the development.

Bethpage Loop is approximately 290 feet in length and is compliant with Sec. 29-5.1 (C) (i) (F) of the UDC. No more than 30 units will be served by any single segment of road between intersections as required by Sec. 29-5.1 (C) (i) (E) of the UDC. Finally, no street segment will exceed 600 feet in length without an intersection with another street, per Sec. 29-5.1 (C) (ii) of the UDC.

There are technically no permanent terminal streets being proposed within the development, as the terminus of Sagemoor will eventually become a segment of an extension of El Chaparral Avenue and Margate Way will provide future access to the remainder of Tract 5 to the east. 5-foot sidewalks are to be provided along all frontages of public streets within the development, and standard 10-foot utility easements will be dedicated adjacent to public streets upon final platting.

The design of the street network and the use of Sagemoor as the principal point of ingress/egress, temporarily, to the subject 77-lot development has generated significant public concern. Multiple traffic impact studies (TIS) were conducted with respect to the development of Tract 5 with the original occurring in 2014 at the time development of The Brooks Phase 1 was presented and the second occurring in 2017 with the annexation/permanent zoning and subsequent development of The Brooks Phase 2. A detailed description of these studies is presented in the attached Planning Commission staff report.

The TIS prepared in 2017 considered two different development outcomes on the remainder of Tract 5 and considered the existing 87 lots within the Brooks Phase 1 as “background” traffic. The current roadway network within the Brooks Phase 2 was significantly informed by this study. It is of note that the extension of El Chaparral to access this site was not an assumption made by the 2017 TIS, so it assumed all traffic would be utilizing the public street network accessing the Brooks Phase 2.

The 2017 TIS was incorporated into the development agreement for the Brooks Phase 2 and stipulated that Sagemoor Drive be constructed to neighborhood collector standards despite not being identified as such on the CATSO Major Roadway Plan (MRP). Additionally, the development agreement stipulated that Hoylake be constructed to major collector standards despite being identified as a neighborhood collector on the CATSO MRP. Hoylake and Sagemoor have been constructed as recommended by the 2017 TIS.

Per Appendix A [Street Standards] of the UDC, neighborhood collector streets are designed to accommodate an average daily trip (ADT) volume between 1,500 and 3,500 vehicles, and major collectors are designed to accommodate an ADT volume between 3,500 and 8,500 vehicles. If development of the remainder of Tract 5 were to occur at the highest

scenario (276 additional units) projected in the 2017 TIS, the estimated ADT resulting from this level of development and its respective impacts upon Sagemoor and Hoylake fall below or within the volumes of traffic capable of being accommodated by these roadways as presently constructed based upon the volume ranges stated above.

It is of note that parking is only permitted on one side of a neighborhood collector (i.e. Sagemoor) and is not permitted on either side of a major collector (i.e. Hoylake), although on-street parking restrictions are ultimately determined by Public Works. It is further worth noting that Hoylake is presently on the list of streets scheduled for "traffic calming" based on prior evaluation and publicly expressed concerns about speeding and cut-through traffic.

The future extension of El Chaparral Avenue is shown on the PD Plan extending through the northwest corner of the property as a "major" roadway that is part of the CATSO MRP. Addressing the future construction of this improvement is provided for in the attached Development Agreement. The agreement was prepared after considering the uncertain timing of the roadway's extension from Highway WW through adjacent undeveloped property and the fact that connection to Richland Road, to the north, would require installation of a bridge over the Grindstone Creek which is considered by the UDC to be the responsibility of the City via a future CIP project.

The attached development agreement, if approved, would establish developer obligations and "triggers" for a payment in lieu of construction in the amount of \$136,240 and the dedication of right of way to accommodate the future El Chaparral roadway installation. The "triggers" for the payment in lieu and dedication of right of way are as shown below and are tied to the proposed "Phasing Plan" submitted with this application.

1. 40% of the payment in lieu shall be paid to the City concurrent with the recording of any final plat in Phase I (23 lots).
2. The remaining 60% of the payment in lieu shall be paid to the city concurrent with any final plat in Phase II (36 lots), or shall become due and payable 10 years from the date of recording of any final plat in Phase I, whichever occurs first.
3. Right-of-way for El Chaparral shall be dedicated to the city upon the first of the following to occur:
 - a. Written notice from the Director of Public Works that such dedication is necessary
 - b. Final platting of Phase III (18 lots)
 - c. 10 years from the date of recording of the initial final plat of Phase I.

The Planning & Zoning Commission considered this request at their September 4, 2025 meeting. Staff presented its report, supporting rationale for its recommendation of approval, and acknowledged community response to the request. Commissioners inquired about the previous TIS performed in 2017 and the impacts it considered. Staff responded that the TIS considered two scenarios of development for the tract, one of which considered the maximum number of units that could be constructed per the current SOI dictating the development opportunity on the site. Following a series of additional questions and response from staff regarding specifics about the proposal the public hearing was opened.

The applicant provided commentary on the request, indicating that they were pursuing something in alignment with the existing SOI, and that the infrastructure on-site is adequate to handle impacts from the development. The applicant detailed the history of development and ownership of the parcels within Tract 5, noting that Phase I of the Brooks was also a portion of Tract 5.

Thereafter, there were extensive comments made by community members in opposition to the proposal. Notably, residents from the Brooks opposed the project due to induced traffic from additional dwellings. They stated that Hoylake would experience greater safety concerns than presently exist, and that Sagemoor could experience similar safety concerns. Residents also expressed concerns about neighborhood compatibility, citing the proposal would result in "triplexes" and high-density development, and that the development won't be held to the same property maintenance standards as their subdivision which was governed by a homeowner's association. Residents further argued that the developer should not be able to derive vehicular access through the public streets platted and developed within their subdivision, citing traffic concerns that could be created from the extension of these streets. Residents also questioned the adequacy of the existing traffic study.

Following the closing of the public hearing, the Commissioners posed some additional questions to staff about the street classifications, traffic calming measures, adjacent zoning, proposed housing typology, why an updated TIS was not required, and the criteria by which the Commission should be evaluating the project.

After due consideration, a motion was made to approve the proposed PD Plan/Preliminary Plat, inclusive of the design exceptions relating to lot standards, and the updated, UDC-compliant Statement of Intent subject to an agreed upon development agreement. The motion was seconded and approved by a (7-1) vote of the Commission.

Following the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing and based on public concerns regarding alleged traffic impacts being introduced within the Brooks Subdivision as a result of the proposed development, the applicant requested that CBB Transportation Engineers + Planners re-evaluate the traffic conclusions referenced in the 2017 TIS with the Ashford Place development being specifically considered. The results of this re-evaluation are shown in the attached letter from CBB dated October 23, 2025, which states:

"the existing design of both Hoylake Drive and Sagemoor Drive did consider future development north of The Brooks and both roadways are forecasted to have an ADT well within the City's recommended volume for a collector roadway even if the North Tract were to develop with the allowable 276 homes. To reiterate the proposed Ashford Place development is only 77 homes versus the maximum allowed of 276."

The letter prepared by CBB does not indicate that modifications or adjustments to the required improvements recommended in the 2017 TIS being implemented.

The Planning and Zoning Commission staff report, locator maps, PD development plan, Statement of Intent, Tree Survey, Phasing Proposal, Ashford Place Trip Memo dated October 23, 2025, Development Agreement, 2010 SOI, 2010 Development Agreement, 2014 TIS, 2017 Development Agreement, 2017 TIS, combined public correspondence, and meeting minute excerpts are attached for review.

Fiscal Impact

Short-Term Impact: None anticipated. Any costs associated with the extension or relocation of public utility infrastructure will be borne by the applicant.

Long-Term Impact: Potential costs may include increased public safety and trash collection services as well as increased public infrastructure maintenance (i.e. electric, roads, sewer, and water) to the site. These increased costs may or may not be off-set by user fees or increased tax collection.

Strategic & Comprehensive Plan Impact

Strategic Plan Impacts:

Primary Impact: Inclusive and Equitable Community, Secondary Impact: Not Applicable, Tertiary Impact: Not Applicable

Comprehensive Plan Impacts:

Primary Impact: Land Use & Growth Management, Secondary Impact: Economic Development, Tertiary Impact: Mobility, Connectivity, and Accessibility

Legislative History

Date	Action
12/07/2010	Approved annexation of property on the south side of Richland Road, inclusive of the subject site, adoption of permanent zoning as PUD-4, and authorization of a development agreement. (Ord. 020801)

Suggested Council Action

Approve the proposed PD Development Plan serving as a preliminary plat to be known as "Ashford Place" and a "site-specific" Statement of Intent as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Additionally, authorize the City Manager to execute the attached development agreement between the City and applicant to establish development obligations relating to required public improvements within the subject acreage.