

---

## Opposition to Rezoning Request # 260-2024 - 4414 Smith Dr

---

Sonya Germain <sgermain@veteransunited.com>

Thu, Nov 7, 2024 at 3:27 PM

To: "timothy.teddy@como.gov" <timothy.teddy@como.gov>, "patrick.zenner@como.gov" <patrick.zenner@como.gov>, "david.kunz@como.gov" <david.kunz@como.gov>, "ward4@como.gov" <ward4@como.gov>, "Mayor@CoMo.gov" <Mayor@como.gov>

Cc: "germain.dustinp@gmail.com" <germain.dustinp@gmail.com>

Hello again!

My name is Sonya Germain, and I have lived at 4411 Sussex Drive, directly to the South of the property in question, for ten years with my husband and two children who are 11 and 9 years old. I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed re-zoning of the property on Smith Drive from R-1 single-family home to R-MF.

When we first purchased our home, we were aware that the forested area on the north side of Smith Drive might eventually be developed - and it was. Additionally, we assumed that the owners of the property in question may eventually sell - however, we presumed that any future development would consist of multiple single-family homes, which would fit the character of our neighborhood. I would support rezoning to R-2 for the right use case - however, R-MF provides too much housing density as well as potential building height for the location proposed.

To ensure the commission gets a complete picture of the lay of the land, I'll note that the surrounding homes to the south of the property have downward sloping backyards leading up to their houses. From the North facing view of our two-story home, you can see the Baracco home from both the ground level and very clearly from the second floor. Unlike the other properties that have been referenced as "similar" along Scott Blvd and in the Westbury development, there is not **any** kind of natural barrier between the properties to the South and the property in question - no creek or treeline whatsoever. Any multi-story development on this property will significantly reduce or remove the privacy and quiet that we and our neighbors have come to expect from living in an established residential neighborhood.

The Westbury development has already brought a significant increase in traffic, light pollution, and noise. Re-zoning this property to R-MF will lead to increased traffic, as even more residents come and go, potentially causing congestion on roads that were not designed to handle such volumes. This has already become an issue, as I'm sure residents in the Hamlet, Stoneridge, and residents near Louisville Park can confirm - and is further complicated by ongoing development in the Breckenridge subdivision, and more businesses coming to the Westbury. While Smith Dr is designated as a "feeder" - it does not seem like the traffic is being handled effectively even now.

While there has been some commentary that this change would promote "walkability" in the area - my experience suggests otherwise. My 9-year-old daughter and I attempted to walk from our home to Moser's, and it was challenging ranging on impossible from our home due to inconsistent sidewalks, insufficient crosswalks, and many vehicle-centric businesses in the Westbury - a car wash, a tire shop, and a gas station, along with a drive-thru fast food restaurant. When the Westbury was originally sold to the neighborhood, quite a different experience was presented from the developer salesmen compared to what is now reality. I worry about this being a similar situation.

Ultimately, the re-zoning could also negatively affect property values in the surrounding neighborhoods. Potential homebuyers may be deterred by the proximity to congested areas and the associated traffic, noise, and privacy concerns, which could reduce the desirability of our area and impact current homeowners' investments.

While I understand and agree with the need for additional affordable housing options in Columbia, this is not the appropriate location for a high-density housing development. I strongly oppose the re-zoning of the property on Smith Drive from R-1 single-family home to R-MF. It would negatively impact traffic, noise levels, privacy, property values, and infrastructure, making it an unfavorable option for current residents. Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Sonya Germain

Senior Group Product Manager



573-876-2600 ext 3681

[sgerman@vu.com](mailto:sgerman@vu.com)

---

Now for the *fine fun* print. You don't need a ladder to see why homebuyers like Air Force Veteran Oden R. are *Through the Roof* about their Veterans United experience: "We're home! Working with Veterans United was easy from beginning to end. We handled our part, and our loan squad took care of everything else. Buying our home turned out cooler than a polar bear's toenails!" For more cool words like Oden's, [check out our 385,000+ unedited, unfiltered homeowner reviews](#). And they're not the only ones through the roof about Veterans United! We're proud to be named 2024's Top VA Lender by U.S. News & World Report, Investopedia, and Bankrate.

NOTICE: Email is not a secure medium. If you have important documents for your loan team, you can securely upload them to [MyVeteransUnited](#) or provide this information by fax, mail, or phone. Please don't send sensitive personal information regarding your loan or personal identity in your emails or as an attachment.

550 Veterans United Drive Columbia, MO 65201. Mortgage Research Center, LLC is an Equal Opportunity Lender, not endorsed or affiliated with a government agency. NMLS # 1907 ([nmlsconsumeraccess.org](http://nmlsconsumeraccess.org)). Licensed in all 50 states. For State Licensing information, please visit [www.veteransunited.com/licenses/](http://www.veteransunited.com/licenses/)

---

## Case # 260-2024 Letter of Opposition

---

dbeman claronsolutions.com <dbeman@claronsolutions.com>

Tue, Nov 19, 2024 at 4:05 PM

To: "Mayor@CoMo.gov" <Mayor@como.gov>, "ward4@como.gov" <ward4@como.gov>, "timothy.teddy@como.gov" <timothy.teddy@como.gov>, "patrick.zenner@como.gov" <patrick.zenner@como.gov>, "david.kunz@como.gov" <david.kunz@como.gov>

My name is Dave Beman and my address is [4800 Greenwich Circle, Columbia, MO](#).

My comments are regarding CASE #260-2024 for 4414 Smith Drive.

**I STRONGLY OPPOSE a re-zoning of 4414 Smith Drive to R-MF and believe the parcel should remain R-1.**

- 1. More high-density units are not needed in this area and will increase traffic congestion, along with noise, personal safety, and crime concerns.**

My understanding is that there are already approvals for approximately 250 high-density units on the parcels north of Smith Drive. Not all have been built yet. This is in addition to the commercial development built and approved north of Smith Drive.

Further consideration should be given to the R-1 subdivision currently being built at the west end of Smith Drive, which will continue increase traffic on Smith as homes are completed.

Per the Planning and Zoning Commission report authored by David Kunz, rezoning 4414 Smith Dr. to R-MF would allow up to 84 high-density units to be built on the 4414 Smith parcel.

Assuming only 72 of the maximum-allowed 84 units are built, this will have a negative impact on traffic volumes on Smith Drive. I'm confused by the assertion in the report that "multi-family residential uses actually generate less traffic than a traditional R-1 subdivision". Using Mr. Kunz's table of trips per dwelling unit for R-1 and R-MF, the projected trip counts per day for three scenarios can be calculated as follows:

Property with the current SF dwelling: 1 unit x 9.52 trips = 9.52 trips/day

Property assuming a total of 16 SF units: 16 units x 9.52 trips = 152 trips/day

Property assuming a total of 72 MF units: 72 units x 6.65 trips = 479 trips/day

**Comparing 72 MF units to the current dwelling, trips increase 50 times (479/9.52).**

**Comparing 72 MF units to 16 SF units, trips increase 3.15 times (479/152).**

Thus, building out the parcel with 72 MF units versus 16 SF units would result in **TRIPLE** the traffic congestion. This would seem to refute the assertion in the Planning report that MF land uses reduce traffic congestion.

Adding 72+ more units south of Smith, with access **ONLY** to Smith Drive, will make issues associated with high-density land uses worse (**traffic congestion, noise, crime, personal safety concerns**). And the parcel's closeness to the Scott Blvd/Smith Drive traffic light makes it even worse.

I believe this type of development will negatively affect the surrounding R-1 property values.

2. **Smith Drive currently provides a buffer between the multi-family and commercial development to the north of Smith Drive and the existing R-1 housing neighborhoods to the South of Smith.**

-

Adding multi-family and/or commercial development South of Smith will **ELIMINATE** the already existing buffer and is not consistent with the R-1 neighborhoods to the South. The argument posed by A Civil Group and the applicant Joe Barraco that more high-density development, closer to the neighborhoods south of Smith, will “provide a buffer for the R1 neighborhoods” is not logical. It will make things worse by eliminating the buffer.

3. **The zoning change is NOT NEEDED at this time.** The current developments North of Smith and the commercial space on Scott Blvd. are not fully occupied or built out, indicating that there is no current or near-term need for an R-MF zoning request to be approved.
4. **If a zoning request of R-MF is approved, there is no guarantee of the kind of development that will take place by the future new owner when the property is sold.**

I object to the blanket nature of the re-zoning request, where approval may be granted without any idea of what will actually be built.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Regards,**

Dave Beman