

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**September 4, 2025**

**Case Number 231-2025**

**A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Troy Miller Properties, LLC (owner) for approval of a site-specific PD plan and new 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). The rezoning establishes a development plan for the parcel, inclusive of 77 single-family attached dwelling units. Additional lots depicted on the plan are designated for comment areas. (This case was tabled at the July 10 and August 7, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission meetings.)**

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report.

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed PD plan, serving as a preliminary plat, and the revised statement of intent, subject to a development agreement satisfactory to the City and agreed to by the applicant prior to introduction of this case to City Council. Furthermore, given the potential that the final negotiation of a mutually-acceptable development agreement may result in required changes to the proposed development plan, staff recommends approval of this request subject to technical corrections resulting from finalization of anticipated development agreement.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have any -- have had any contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I will note that I was contacted; however, I did not have a conversation with an individual.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Anyone else receive any outside contact? Thank you. Folks, I don't mind that you have signs, but I'm going to need you to keep them down. Thank you very much. Appreciate that. We're trying to have a -- as calm a discussion as we can tonight. That would be great. Questions for staff? Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: I'm looking at Figure 9 of the traffic impact study from 2017, and it just is -- I'm looking at the north tract that they identify as having 85 homes, and then I'm looking at the tract that we're looking at that's under consideration, and it's just like a third of that.

MR. KUNZ: Uh-huh.

MR. DARR: So are we using up all of that allotment of traffic for just this development? What about the two tracts to the east of that, or am I not seeing that correctly?

MR. KUNZ: No. For -- you are seeing it correctly that the however many trips that were

considered in one scenario was comprehensively for all the -- or all the parcels that hadn't been developed at that point. It also considered 276, so that would be greater than the 80-something that was considered at that time, so that could be considered appropriate or, I guess, a valid TIS still, but it also could be that we need to perform a new TIS if these other two parcels do end up developing.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Darr, if I may. The subdivision of the eastern tracts of which -- sorry, the western tracts that were outside of the Phase 1 of The Brooks --

MR. DARR: Uh-huh.

MR. ZENNER: -- occurred after 2017. And so what you see on parcel maps today, those tracts were all part of what the study was considering. They were one tract of land at that point. They have subsequently been further subdivided and connected with the parcels that are to the north and have access off of Richland Road. And that is probably why it only appears as though the traffic study is saying 85 trips for the entire undeveloped acreage. And then as Mr. Kunz has indicated, they did the alternative of 276 for all of the remaining undeveloped acreage, which was at one point one leftover tract from Tract 5.

MR. DARR: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Further questions for staff? Seeing none. We are going to open the floor to public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm going to do a little bit about our rules for the evening. We're going to try to get through everybody. Part of that means that I have to put a time limit on everybody. So we're going to do six minutes for the applicants, or if you are here representing a group, three minutes if you are here as an individual. I've got my timer on my phone. If you hear it going off, I'm not getting text messages. That means your time is up. We're going to not use bad language. We're going to not disparage people based on any of their inherent characteristics, and we're going to not be disruptive. We can get through this and we will come to a decision at the end of it. We love hearing from the public. I am so excited you all are here. Let's have a good meeting and come to a conclusion that everybody feels okay about at the end of the day; all right? All right. Whenever you're ready -- oh, also, name and address for the record. I'm sorry, we have to have that because we're the Planning and Zoning Commission, so name and address for the record before you start. Go ahead.

MR. GREENE: Good evening. Andy Greene with Crockett Engineering Consultants, offices at 1000 West Nifong Boulevard, Building Number 1. I'm going to be requesting only three minutes of your time tonight, and I will turn that over to Tim Crockett to follow me up. Here to discuss the Ashford Place Development, which David did a great job giving the staff report, I, myself, Andy Greene, Tim Crockett, Caleb Colbert here to represent and talk a little bit about the project. Overview again, I won't go to an in-depth of it, but roughly 24 acres on the west side of an existing PD zoned property. This is not a rezoning request tonight, we are simply submitting a PD plan that conforms to the existing zoning on the property. The current zoning even specifically calls out for the use of a three-unit building, which is what our

proposal includes. Our proposal will also conform to the original Statement of Intent from 2010, with the original zoning as well as all City of Columbia regulations moving forward. Again, just a picture shaded in green where the project is located, and, again, a snip just showing you what the project looks like as it relates to the network and layout of the property. So just to talk a little bit about the history of the zoning in the area, as David previously covered, everything in blue back in 2010 was annexed and zoned into the City of Columbia with a PD zoning. The shaded green tract is referenced Tract 5 within that zoning, which got assigned a residential density of PUD 4. That's four units per acre. In 2013, our client, Troy Miller Properties purchased a 24-acre portion on the east side of the green property there shaded in blue, which is the subject property we've got today. So in 2014, The Brooks Plat Number 1, which is shaded in darker green on the east side of the Tract 5 in blue was approved from a zoning and preliminary plat perspective. Following that in 2017, The Brooks Plat Number 1 was constructed. After that, in 2017, to the south, Brooks Phase 2 was annexed and zoned residential. That borders the south property here that we've got. Following that, in 2018, The Brooks Plat Number 2 was constructed, and following that in '22, The Brooks Plat Number 3 was constructed. I'm trying to paint the picture here that the property was zoned in 2010. It's been there in place all while The Brooks developed basically to the east and the south. All utilities are available and on site ready to serve the development. They are appropriately sized and have the capacity including sewer, water, electric, and stormwater. Here is a conceptual unit plan of the three-unit structure. Just wanted to kind of show that of what -- what we're thinking for the unit, and then here's a sample floor plan, again, with the three units and some elevations there on the right. Phasing, as David talked about, will be done in three general phases, phase 1 on the southwest, phase 2 there on the east, and then finally in green would be phase 3. And with that, I'll turn it over to Tim Crockett. Thank you for your time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Oh, any questions, or do you mind taking -- sorry. Sorry, Tim. We'll get back to you. Any questions for this speaker? All right. Easy enough.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering Consultants, 1000 West Nifong. As Andy indicated, I would like to have the six minutes for my presentation. A lot to cover, so I'm going to go very quickly. If you have questions, please feel free to ask them. I'm going to cover density, traffic, parking, green space, and the Statement of Intent. First of all, the density. The density, as indicated by staff, is a PUD 4, four units per acre, and we're asking for 3.2 units per acre. You're going to hear some correspondence tonight that talks about that's high-density apartments. Honestly, 3.2, that's -- that's in the range of single-family densities all over Columbia. Most of our densities that we have in Columbia for single family are 1.5 to 4 units per acre. Moderate density, at best, is at six to ten, and high density for apartments that this project has been claimed to be is 12 to 20. We're nowhere near that. So in comparison, you can see where The Brooks is. The Brooks, as a whole, the entire development of The Brooks is about 2.1 units per acre. The Brooks Plat 3, which is the plat that we directly abut, is 2.6. There is not much difference between 2.6 and the 3.2 that we're looking at tonight. Eastport Gardens, you've got some correspondence in -- in your staff report, or, excuse me, in

your staff correspondence that had pictures of cars parked all over the streets. That was in Eastport Gardens with a density of 5.3. Other densities are similar -- of similar developments, the residence at Old Hawthorne is 5.0, Amberton, which this Commission approved not long ago, was at seven and a half. It was a much denser development, and it didn't have any parking issues. No one had concerns with the parking that we had at Amberton at a higher density. Vintage Falls and, of course, those at Old Hawthorne are similar densities that we're proposing. The traffic, is that going to be a concern? A lot of folks have issues with the traffic. The major roadways in this area have been vetted by CATSO. If you're not familiar with CATSO, it's the major roadway plan for the City of Columbia. There's a Technical Committee and a Coordinating Committee. Both of those have representatives, engineers, and planners from both the City, the County, and MoDOT, so they determine where the major roads to throughout the -- throughout the City. The traffic from Ashford Place was accounted for when The Brooks was developed. So when The Brooks went in, to answer your question, Mr. Darr, that piece of property to the north, the Tract 5, took into account 267 or whatever the number it was, that number, it took the numbers of acres available by four units per acre, and that's the density that it -- that it assigned. That's how many units was assigned to that. So there's plenty of density left for those remaining two tracts of land. Streets in The Brooks were built to accommodate the proposed traffic, so while there is additional traffic coming from this project, Sagemoor and Hoylake were expanded or grew to neighborhood and major collector standards to account for that -- wider pavements, wider right-of-ways. And, of course, there's not just the streets themselves, but there are also some other off-site improvements, turn lanes and signals, to be exact. Here's the traffic -- a snippet from that 2017 report. It's hard to read. You can see Sagemoor, the green on the left, and Hoylake, the blue on the right. It says that's the proposed roadways within The Brooks Phase 2 development would adequately serve the proposed subdivision in addition to the future development of the north tract, which refers to Tract 5 and portion of this development. So the traffic was all vetted through MoDOT, as well as City of Columbia. Parking has been questioned, as well. We are looking at two spaces per unit. The original Statement of Intent says the total number of parking spaces proposed is 1,184. That's based on the maximum number of units you can get four units per acre over the entire Tract 5. However, the actual number may be more or less, so as long as it complies with the City of Columbia regulations. The City of Columbia regulations require two spaces per dwelling. There is additional on-street parking that is available. Here's an exhibit that shows our available spaces that we can have. I believe Mr. Kunz talked about having 60, we come up with 68, so there is adequate parking if we needed it on the street themselves. However, if it became a problem, we have two locations that we can add small parking lots, so we can add some additional parking if that ever becomes an issue. So we can have upwards of 20 additional parking spaces, off-street parking if needed. The green space, of the total 24 acres that we have on site, about 43 percent or over ten acres is going to be in common lots. Then we add in the landscaping and yards, that's another 27 percent or so, six and a half acres. Total open space is about 70 percent on this site. You don't see that very often when you're talking about to have single family. So, you know, that's single-family density. Statement of Intent, we're going to hear a

lot about where we're just doing the minimums. We're doing just the minimum. But here's a comparison of the two Statements of Intent. The original Statement of Intent said one family and one family attached. We're doing single family attached. The maximum number of units on the original Statement of Intent was 96, and we're proposing 77, a reduction in that total density. Building heights stay the same. Parking ratio we talked about. We're increasing the front yard setback to give it that more single-family feel. Landscaping is staying the same and our open space is increasing greatly. So we're not hitting the minimums, we're doing more than that. The Statement of Intent, I believe, from the original -- from the very original zoning out here, this is specifically what it states. 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 in a large lot containing several units. In addition, there may be up to three units in a single building. We're proposing one-family attached on zero lot line lots with up to three units in a single building. We're complying with that original Statement of Intent. The proposed plan not only complies with the original statement of intent, but we believe that the original Statement of Intent intended for this exact type of development. And so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Crockett? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I'm just interested in this for context. So when this began in 2010, has there been a single developer in charge or supervising or orchestrating the entire development, these various phases we've had -- we've seen here?

MR. CROCKETT: In 2010, there was a single developer that was in charge of all that. However, during the recession, he lost the property. It went through bank foreclosure. That bank went under, and therefore, it went to the FDIC, and so then it was divvied up and then it was kind of dispersed at that point. So it's had a -- it's had a tough past.

MR. WALTERS: So as the previous speaker illustrated at the various phases, those phases were done by different entities?

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. And so let's go back to that, Mr. Walters. Okay. Yes. So let's go to this slide right here. So all of that right there in blue, that comprises the five tracts of land. That was the original 2010 rezoning. That included some commercial, some other PUD up along Richland, and then this was Tract 5. And so what happened is somewhere along the way when it went through the bank foreclosure, it went to several investment bankers who bought it from the FDIC, it got so divided into multiple tracts of land. One tract of land was purchased by my client. The next two properties were purchased by another individual and then another developer purchased what's shaded in green, and so that was The Brooks Plat 1.

MR. WALTERS: All right. Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker?

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Seeing none.

MR. CROCKETT: Back to -- okay. Perfect. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Next person to speak on this case? Please come forward. Yeah. I don't have a list, so work it out amongst yourselves. Name and address for the record, and then start when you're ready.

MS. DELLA VECCHIA: Tracy Della Vecchia, 600 Sahalee Court, Columbia, Missouri 65201. Sahalee Court is in Phase 1 of The Brooks Subdivision. It's not just numbers and engineering on paper. While it's true -- I'm going to read this very fast. While it's true that Sagemoor Drive will serve as the sole ingress for 77 families in the tri-plexes, a situation that alone should halt this proposed development, I'd like to draw attention to a more fundamental issue. The plan contradicts the Planning and Zoning Commission's own strategies for safe neighborhood streets, a fact that should prompt a reconsideration of the developer's plan. When I first set my sights on buying a home in The Brooks, the entrance was only off of Rolling Hills onto to Hoylake Drive. Hoylake Drive was half the size that is now. Hoylake Drive culminated at a barricade next to the resident of 5054 Hoylake Drive. There's four homes on Hoylake Drive in that section that their driveways point to the streets, and you have to be on that busy street now to get in and out of the driveway. You guys approved that with a nod to the developer even -- because at that time, it wasn't a through street, and it was the Planning and Zoning Commission had already approved that those driveways be open to Hoylake Drive. When I went back to buy my home in the fall of 2019, the transformation of Hoylake into a connecting street and a bustling thoroughfare was shocking. We bought our home in 2019 during the years of constructions of Phases 2 and 3 of The Brooks. I traversed every nook and cranny in my morning four-mile walks. I couldn't help -- help but notice that none of the driveways in Phases 2 and 3 of The Brooks open onto Hoylake, for which I am deeply grateful. The Planning and Zoning Commission would not have sanctioned additional driveways opening directly onto a now connecting street. During my morning walks, I had -- I have had several close calls with speeding traffic rushing from Rolling Hills to WW using it as their own personal shortcut around high traffic areas. Hoylake in its current state poses a significant danger to joggers, walkers, children, dogs, and families with strollers. It's a throughfare street right down the middle of a family neighborhood. I've lived here for nearly six years, and the City is only now taking action to address the safety issues. It can take five or more years to construct speed bumps, apparently we're 34 on the list. Fast forward to 2020, and by the time they get to it, it will be 11 years before they address the issue. Fast forward to 2025, and deja vu. We have Sagemoor Drive in The Brooks Phase 3, with homeowners' driveways opening into it, approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission. It's closed off with a barricade at the end of the street. The Planning and Zoning Commission rightly approved those driveways opening onto the street because it's not a connecting road and not a busy thoroughfare. If this development is approved, the situation with Sagemoor Drive will be no different from that of Hoylake Drive. The potential dangers of Sagemoor Drive being a connecting street cannot be overlooked. This is a concern for all of you and all of us. We don't need a crystal ball to predict what the outcome of this will be. It will be more than a

decade since opening up Hoylake as a major connecting street for the City to put something in place to address the safety hazards -- very real safety hazards, not just numbers and not just an engineering report. The same thing is going to happen on Sagemoor.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, ma'am. Could you wrap up? Sorry.

MS. DELLA VECCHIA: We need a solution to this before the development can be approved, and the problem that we all know will happen, and indeed it's the responsibility of the Commission to do everything in its power to prevent unsafe streets. The bottom line is the developer is the one that needs to create the streets that go in and out of it, and it's not Sagemoor that is the street that goes in and out of his complex.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Okay, folks. Next person to speak on this case, please come forward.

MS. HAUSWIRTH: Good evening.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Pull that down to you, ma'am.

MS. HAUSWIRTH: Good evening.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Pull that down to you, ma'am. Thank you.

MS. HAUSWIRTH: Good evening. My name is Gail Hauswirth, and I live at 5338 Harbor Town Drive adjacent to Hoylake Drive. My husband and I moved to The Brooks in 2018 seeking a quiet place to age in place, trusting that Planning and Zoning would protect our homeowners' peace and safety, and if we had known Hoylake was going to be a major collector, we would have never purchased the home. Today, even simple tasks like crossing Hoylake Drive to get my mail are dangerous. There are no crosswalks or speed bumps, and speeding traffic often wakes us at night. Adding a large new development will only worsen these problems. Supporters of Ashford Place point to a 2017 traffic study by CBB based on the ITE Trip Generation Model. In my professional career with data analysis, I learned that all models have blind spots. This one predicts traffic only from new driveways. It does not capture cut-through traffic when drivers re-route through neighborhoods as a shortcut. In other words, the exact traffic we already struggle with is invisible to this model. The model used to justify that there's adequate capacity on these streets doesn't see the cut-through traffic at all. This limitation is acknowledged by the ITE manual, itself, as well as transportation authorities in Boston, Portland, Austin, and Seattle, which require real world follow-up studies and mitigation before approving new projects. Columbia has not taken those steps. If Planning and Zoning relies on the 2017 study, it will result in a misleading analysis of the new development's impacts, inadequate mitigation measures, and long-term harm to the safety and livability of our neighborhood. We are not anti-growth. We are simply asking Planning and Zoning to balance new development with protections for existing residents. Without major mitigation, Ashford Place will bring long-term safety and livability problems for The Brooks. Good growth should not leave us feeling victimized. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Okay. Are there any questions for this speaker?

MS. HAUSWIRTH: Yes, sir.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Great presentation. So let's talk about your data.

MS. HAUSWIRTH: Yes, sir.

MR. STANTON: If traffic is an issue and we're assuming that this is going to increase through not only the invisible traffic that you discussed but the increase in the development, what is your alternative to what is on the table right now? If you were in their shoes, what is your -- what is your alternative to this?

MS. HAUSWIRTH: Well, I think there are several things that would mitigate. Obviously, traffic calming measures within the existing subdivision. But more importantly, if this is to be approved, he needs to have the roads to accommodate the development, and it's a matter of are we getting the cart ahead of the horse? Are we putting something in that we don't really have the capacity or the finances, if we can't afford the roads, maybe it's not yet time for this development.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight, ma'am. Next?

MS. MCCOY: My name is Holly McCoy, and I live on 809 Sagemoor Drive. My issue, as a resident of The Brooks, and specifically as a homeowner on Sagemoor, is the increase in traffic, like she spoke. Already the street in front of our home has collapsed and had to have been replaced. That was done in October of 2024. So I just understand that Troy Miller owns this, and he should be allowed to develop it as he sees fit, but a new development that leeches into an existing neighborhood when it benefits from you or negatively impacts the adjacent area without providing reciprocal benefits, it's a parasite. The Ashford Place development would be an example of this. And so the appropriate action that I would respectfully request is that Mr. Miller take this development and build his own roads into it the same way that the developers of The Brooks had to build their own roads to develop this. They didn't cut through another subdivision to create this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing -- oh, sorry. Commissioner Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: What do you mean by this -- Mr. Miller should build his own roads?

MS. MCCOY: Well, just like you said, El Chaparral could go through. Can a road be built from Richland? You have Richland and Rolling Hills. You have lots of other ways to access this, than to use Sagemoor, the street that I live on, as their only means to get into their development, which is going to increase the traffic dramatically.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCCOY: Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much, ma'am. Next?

MR. DUKE: I was here before, so I've been here. My name is Jon Duke. I live in phase 1 of The Brooks Development, 5317 Harbor Town Drive. I moved in 2018, and I have seen The Brooks being developed. I have reviewed this proposal and it's apparently a high-density proposal. It appears to me



that there are three units attached in each lot. The lots are developed that are basically a little oversized lot. They're about 96 feet wide at the street. Generally, city lots are 60 by 90. They can be larger. County lots are generally 70 wide by 110 to 120, and they can be larger. These lots are designed for a single home. Each lot will have three units that have common walls between them. The units are 28 feet wide, 66 feet long, which is a little larger than a double-wide mobile home. Each unit will have a single car garage within the unit which will reduce the square footage of that unit by 200 square feet. The proposal does not indicate if the units would be two-story, and what the time that I got the information, I wasn't aware of that. The backyard of each unit will be 28 feet wide and 25 feet deep, about the same size as a double-car garage, so it is high density. The Brooks is a nice neighborhood with great neighbors. It is with quiet, and with few exceptions, well maintained. In talking to the neighbors, we would like to keep it this way. Most of us have seen neighbors with rentals in high-density units, and do not wish to have the same general issues in our neighborhood. In regard to traffic issues, currently we have a problem with speeders on Hoylake and it's been addressed several times. Some of the vehicles may be traveling 45 to 50 miles an hour. I've actually seen them go faster than that. I generally drive about 25 to 29 miles per hour on Hoylake and the cars pass me on the curves and on the hills and blow their horns at me and do all kinds of things. It's a major issue. And if you want to know why I can tell what the speed of the cars, I'll give that information later. Many of the families that presently live in The Brooks have young children. They ride bikes, scooters, roller blades, and most of them don't look at the street before they roll into it with their bikes. The proposed states that vehicles will not be allowed to park on the street. That was the original proposal. Apparently, they've changed that. And number two is who is going to enforce it, unless the City goes out and violates it. I have concerns about the width of the streets. The streets are basically 28 feet wide, and with a fire truck, they probably won't be able to go down there because if there's a vehicle that is a monstrous pickup truck parked on each side of the street, that's going to be nine feet and nine feet, that's 18 feet. The fire truck is going to be nine feet wide. They would only leaves a foot and a half for that vehicle to go through if everybody is parked the way they're supposed to be parked.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, sir. If you could wrap up, that would be great.

MR. DUKE: Okay. The amount of traffic is basically the issue. The national average is 1.83 vehicles per household. With 26 lots and only one house on each lot, that would be 47.58 vehicles. With the proposed of 77 units on 26 lots, that would mean there would be 141 vehicles. That's a monstrous -- a lot. So apparently we're going to have a parking problem, and the problem is musical vehicles, one car garage and a driveway. Who goes to work first? Do they come home first?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, sir.

MR. DUKE: Who goes to work second, who comes home second?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. DUKE: So how are they going to keep parking those cars off the street?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm going to ask the same question I asked the previous speaker. Thank you for your data. So let's talk data. If you do not like 77, it sounds like you would like single-family 44. Right?

MR. DUKE: Yes. Twenty-six lots.

MR. STANTON: It's still an increase of traffic.

MR. DUKE: Yes. But it's 40 vehicles and not 140 vehicles.

MR. STANTON: And I guess my next question would be, if you were in their shoes, that's what you were proposes more of that single-family.

MR. DUKE: If I had anything to do with the development, it would be single-family homes.

MR. STANTON: All right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any other questions for this speaker? Seeing -- oh, Commissioner Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: I may not have remembered correctly, but when the proponents spoke, they spoke about the density of the adjoining one -- existing density, was that 2.6 per acre? Two point six times twenty-four is 62 units as a comparison versus 87 that are being proposed, just as a joint of information.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. DUKE: Well, I -- my understanding has always been it's been four houses per acre, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, sir. Any other questions. Seeing none. Next? Go ahead and start, please.

MS. KIRKPATRICK: Good evening. My name is Peggy Kirkpatrick; I live at 713 Sagemoor. I am four houses up from the proposed development. First of all, I want to say thank you to all of you for volunteering and putting up with all of us every month. I am a little bit confused on one thing that I think Tim, you said it wasn't a rezoning issue, and yet it says here in your own minutes the rezoning establishes a development plan for the parcel. I'm a little -- is this a rezoning issue or not? So that's question number one. Question number 2, Mr. Stanton, you brought up an excellent point of -- you asked Holly, who is my neighbor, how should these -- the traffic come in? Mr. Miller owns the property all the way to Richland Road. He -- part of the land has not been zoned into the City. It's -- it's still County zoned, and I think there's a creek and he would have to build a bridge. When he met with the neighborhood, which we really appreciate, Mr. Miller, that you met with us, he was asked about building the bridge or extending to Richland Road, and he said it was too expensive. That's -- that's a good point, but he is basically building a subdivision without investing at all in the infrastructure of the roads except for what he's going to build with his subdivision. And then the last thing I'd like you to consider is that that whole plot is densely wooded, and it's absolutely gorgeous. We expected it to be developed and naively, we didn't do our due diligence. Naively, we thought it was going to be an extension Phase 4 of The Brooks. What I am asking you to consider, if it's in your power, to require the developer to put a minimum of a 50-foot buffer leaving those beautiful trees in place and acting as -- as a change of landscape, if you will, from single-family dwellings to a more dense development. Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none.  
Thank you for being here tonight.

MS. KIRKPATRICK: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: The next person to speak on this case, please come forward.

MS. ESOCHAGHI: Hi, everybody. My name is Sonrochi Eschaghi; I live at 4505 Royal County Road in Columbia, Missouri. So I just purchased a home a few months ago. So my comment will be very simplistic compared to other people who have spoken here. I think when I heard about this development, I was just very confused about how it's possible to go through one neighborhood to go to another neighborhood. It's just very weird to me. So to get to my house, so Royal County Road intersects Sagemoor, and you come in from Broadway to get to Sagemoor. And so, when I found out that the development would be at the end of Sagemoor Drive, it just seems very weird that you can come in our neighborhood, and that's the only way to get into the neighborhood is to come into our neighborhood to then get another development that's inside the neighborhood. So I know that there are engineering people and people who can do all kinds of -- it just seems really weird to have another neighborhood inside a neighborhood. So I'm not opposed to more apartments, single-family homes, but why can't they have their own entrance instead of coming into our neighborhood to build another neighborhood -- (inaudible). Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none.  
Thank you for being here tonight. Next person to speak?

MR. STEPHENSON: Hi. My name is Caleb Stephenson; I live at 905 Sagemoor Drive, Columbia, Missouri 65201. Thank you for considering my input this evening on this proposed development. I would like to echo a few key reasons why this development ignores neighborhood context, and is poor City planning. Proper City planning dictates that higher-density developments are located near primary arterials, in this case Broadway Avenue or WW, or have dedicated access to not overburden existing infrastructure. However, this higher-density development is located behind lower density developments and exposes current Columbia citizens to increased safety concerns related to traffic and speeding. This dangerous situation exists despite -- excuse me. This dangerous situation will exist despite traffic-calming measures of curved streets and enhanced speed limit signage. Given this higher density development will use a single existing neighborhood street, Sagemoor Avenue, without any traffic-calming measures, our neighborhood has real valid concerns related to increased traffic and speeding. It's poor City planning. Second, this higher-density development provides little to no green space for residents outside of the floodplain land, and little to no buffer between itself and current Columbia neighbors. While this development falls under PUD 4 zoning, the arrangement of 77 units on only 12 acres is actually much denser than what zoning allows. Only by stretching the definition of PUD 4 zoning to include undeveloped floodplain and forest preserve as part of this development, does the zoning actually meet guidelines? Finally, reviewing the tree survey, only the minimum number of trees are being retained. The survey even shows five fully mature trees delineating our boundary between The

Brooks and Ashford Place on the west side of Sagemoor are slated to be removed even though there's no structure planned there. Green space should be prioritized, especially as part of the higher-density development. And this zoning request severely lacks it. This fell short of community expectations, neighborhood compatibility, and it's poor City planning. These are just a few of the many reasons of why I mentioned here this evening of why this development lacks neighborhood compatibility and community expectations. It lacks a primary collector street and taxes existing infrastructure of current neighbors. It falls materially short on traffic safety. It abuses PUD 4 zoning by incorporating a floodplain into density calculations and completely lacks green buffers between existing neighbors. It's poor City planning. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. The next person to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. GERDING: Good evening. My name is Tim Gerding; I'm an attorney, I represent John and Tatyana Shinn at 408 and 412 Kingston Heath Drive, Columbia, Missouri. Very near the intersection of Sagemoor Drive, they own two properties there. Thank you for allowing me to address the Commission this evening on behalf of my clients. We respectfully oppose the proposed Ashford Place development on a number of grounds. As the Commission has heard, this development lacks appropriate infrastructure. We have a purpose to ensure land use decisions implement the City's Comprehensive Plan, preserve neighborhoods stability and safety, and coordinate infrastructure in a safe and orderly manner. A planned development should align with these fundamental objectives. The current proposal disregards these guiding principles by offering no substantive improvements to traffic safety or infrastructure. There is no credible or enforceable proposal for improvements to ensure safe ingress or egress, road enhancements, or pedestrian accommodation, and without any such commitments, the plan undermines both public safety and orderly growth. Where will all the parking be? As I understand it, there can be up to four unrelated residents in each unit of the tri-plex. That's up to -- if I'm understanding this correctly, 12 people or up to maybe 12 or more cars per physical structure versus a single family home of maybe only two or three cars. We understand that the street parking would be low, but maybe one space or three spaces per residence would be appropriate. But as many cars as 12 per structure would be -- would be far in excess. We have an incompatibility with established neighborhood character. We should be protecting stable residential neighborhoods. That proposal is incompatible in scale, intensity and design with the adjacent single-family residences. The closer this development sits to existing homes, the greater the need in transitions in scale and dedicated buffers, none of which appear to be provided here. With this proposal, The Brooks neighborhood residents can look forward to being worried about having their children playing near the street as folks speed through Sagemoor to cut through the neighborhood. Why did Brooks members invest in their HOA organization to pay for the improvements only to have the system stressed by would-be renters of these tri-plex units? The HOA, at least for residents near Sagemoor, might as well not have existed. This is a simply incompatible land use to this established single-family neighborhood. Citizens that purchased housing invested in this

subdivision with the specific understanding that it would be low-density, single-family homes. This type of development is completely unexpected, not planned for, and detrimental to virtually Columbia citizen who -- with an actual stake in this issue. This proposal by the developer, we would suggest is a development afterthought of sorts. We have an absence of any legitimate community benefit and we have residents of The Brooks invested in their properties here in The Brooks relied upon an understanding that this area would be -- was that the end of the three minutes? Thank you, Commissioner.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, sir. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you -- and I assume that you have -- I don't remember seeing what you submitted.

MR. GERDING: I did not submit anything in writing.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, okay. Thank you very much.

MR. GERDING: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And, also, while you're coming up, come on, you're fine. I forgot to say after you asked your question, the zoning is not changing, but they are completing their planned district zoning by providing us the plan.

MS. KIRKPATRICK: Then why wasn't it stated --

MS. GEUEA JONES: It's just -- it's a technicality of how it's stated, but the zoning was PD and will be PD in the future.

MS. KIRKPATRICK: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. I forgot -- I meant to answer that question before you walked away. I apologize. Please go ahead and name and address when you're ready.

MR. MAHER: Good evening. Jack Maher; I'm at 809 Brockton Drive. So a lot of my neighbors have addressed some concerns. Overall, I want to come at this from more of a master plan perspective. Currently, Mr. Miller and another multi-family developer individual by the name of Garry Lewis own over 150 acres in between the northern parcel in The Brooks and going to Richland Road. So it is more than likely that most of the land all the way to Richland in the future is going to be some kind of a high-density or multi-family use. So the question for P & Z and the Council moving forward is when is El Chaparral going to be developed? Is it going to be developed prior to all this happening, or is it going to be developed after all of the traffic flow -- all the traffic patterns have already been, you know, congested onto Sagemoor and Bethpage, and out through Richland? So -- and that being said, there is no connector to Richland right now planned. So that's -- that's a question for the City to review over time that, more than likely, all of this land stretching to Richland is going to be multi-family because why would a single-family developer come in or why would somebody want to purchase and build a new home next to a higher-density development? It just doesn't make sense. That's why all of my neighbors are here today because we've -- we've got HOA values that we're trying to preserve and, you know, this -- this type of development isn't something that is conforming to our neighborhood. It's just that simple. You know, I thought being somebody that's in real estate to begin with and who works with developers all the time, I was very surprised when I saw this come to P & Z, even before our neighbors were approached. I'm

assuming that we weren't approached because it's such an outlandish idea to put tri-plexes on this parcel, that he'd get the backlash that he's seeing here today. But I just want to reiterate to you all that in my mind there is zero percent neighborhood support here for this development, and, you know, it's -- it's very surprising to me that, you know, P & Z is passing this through to the Council, given the bare minimums that are being met here, especially the preservation of the 25 percent trees that are on the northeast corner, and nothing is essentially allowed for a buffer zone here to The Brooks neighborhood that has an HOA. None of this is conforming. We really shouldn't be acting like this is Phase 4 of The Brooks. This is a completely different development, and, you know, at this point, the City can't take El Chaparral as anything that's going to be extended in the next 20 to 30 years. You've got two landowners that own that parcel that haven't developed the land in 20 years. So when is El Chaparral going to get developed? It's -- the developer currently is not putting any funds aside to stretch El Chaparral from WW to Ashford Place.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Thanks.

MR. MAHER: Thank you. Any questions?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Well, I'd like to make a statement. You and several other speakers have acted like you were surprised and so forth.

MR. MAHER: Yeah.

MR. WALTERS: And I don't blame many people for being surprised, but this is of record. I mean, it's been -- it's been specified that this land could accommodate tri-plexes at this density from the get-go. Now I understand it's not part of every homeowner's typical process to go through and read this. I get that, and I'm not blaming them for that. But I think it's kind of a misstatement or mis-- it's surprising in that you're aware of it, but it's not surprising that this is new.

MR. MAHER: No. I think the surprise is that the City would allow a planned zoning on landlocked parcels and then develop -- and then have an R-1 development to the south allowed, and then not provide any other ingress/egress from these parcels here. That's what doesn't make sense to me. I mean, if the intent was to zone this R-2 or R-MF, then that should have been done to begin with. Then we would have known for certain what we were buying when we went there.

MR. WALTERS: Yeah. But it was known. I mean it says -- from the get-go, it says there would be tri-plexes here.

MR. MAHER: No. No. No. No. No. No.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We'll ask staff to restate the Statement of Intent.

MR. MAHER: No. Planned development, this could be single-family homes --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. MAHER: Yeah. So that's not --

MR. WALTERS: If you could clarify?

MR. ZENNER: I'll clarify when we get to the point --

MS. GEUEA JONES: When you get to Commissioner comment. Yeah.

MR. WALTERS: Yeah. How about any comment about the expectation for when Chaparral may be extended? Is that on --

MS. GEUEA JONES: We'll have them look into that for when we get to discussion.

MR. ZENNER: We will provide you that information during the appropriate time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Thank you.

MR. WALTERS: All right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you. And, folks, it makes it real hard to hear what they're saying when you start applauding in the middle of their statements. Just saying. Next person? Next person?

MR. LEVINSON: Good evening. My name is Rob Levinson, 4909 Ballyneal Court. I'm here not only as a member of the neighborhood, but also as a licensed architect for 30 years. I've worked with planning departments, hundreds of planning departments in over 35 states. And we're just now kind of getting into the good part of the conversation tonight. The last two speakers have really hit on what everyone is talking about the symptoms and let's talk about the problem. The problem is that you annexed these parcels into the City as PUD in the first place. They should be -- they should be R-1. And I'm urging you to solve that problem so that developers and all of yourselves don't waste your time and the whole community's time by repeatedly -- this won't be the first one of these meetings that you have. You're going to have a lot more of these meetings because it's just the problem is it's zoned wrong. It's -- it should be not nearly as dense as allowing R-4, essentially. It should be all R-1. It's in the middle. It's a doughnut hole that's surrounded by a doughnut of R-1. What kind of sense does that make to have a super dense neighborhood that's surrounded by low density neighborhood? I just -- as somebody who has served on a planning board, thank you for your time. Appreciate it. It's a thankless task. It's not a very well paid job, I know, so thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you. Next person?

MR. BECKETT: Good evening. Chris Beckett, 1130 Shore Acres Loop. I just have about four items here. The first one is I agree and uphold with a lot of the concerns that our neighbors have said here, especially about the speeding on the -- on Hoylake. I had to stop a young lady the other day who was passing people on the curve. Number 2, Mr. Miller could access this property from his development on Wellington Place. He owns that development, so that -- there is his access that he could access it from there. Number 3, the houses in The Brooks average \$350,000 to \$700,000 to \$800,000. When you have that dollar amount of housing and you're going to be putting in apartments that are \$100,000 to \$125,000 tri-plexes, that's not going to be bringing in the same amount of clientele. A lot of those types of clientele are going to also need mass transportation, which we do not have out there. There are no bus routes out there, no access to city trails or any way to get into town. One other question I have, what about the roads as they tear them up during the construction? If you would look at Veteran's Parkway out

south of town, as they're building those apartments out there from Grindstone to the Circle Drive, that road has -- was a very good road. It is terrible right now. From the roundabout to South Providence is perfect. I wonder what kind of power Veteran's United has to keep the traffic off of that section. So my one question is, does the City or Planning and Zoning, can we require a cash bond to replace that street, Sagemoor, after they destroy it because of the large trucks? I drove large trucks for 45 years. Large trucks destroy residential streets. You cannot patch and repair a street like that. When you get that kind of big trucks, it's going to destroy the street. Someone is going to have to replace it. The City is not going to want to replace it. So someone is going to have to put up the money for that. Or in the past, all the developers had to merge with the City and to build El Chaparral before they built their own subdivisions. I don't understand why that is not par for the course. Let Mr. Miller and the City build that El Chaparral. Let him find the money to come up with that, if he wants to do it from that standpoint rather than Wellington. That's all I have to say.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight.

MR. BECKETT: Thank you, all.

MS. GEUEA JONES: The next person to speak, please come forward. Next?

MR. HAUPT: My name is Terry Haupt, I live at 1224 Shore Acres Loop in The Brooks. The intended use of this property is a total falsehood from the way that it is being presented to this Committee, City Council members, as well as the public. Nothing could be further from the truth and the way it's being built. This is as a single-family attached dwelling unit that can be individually owned. Mr. Miller has no intention of selling any of his units. He has no intention of building a road across his property. He owns the property up to Richland. He has no intention of building that road. He has no intention of doing any -- building any amenities or using open space for any recreation. His only intention is to build as many units as he can to get as much money as he can. I say this whole thing is about greed.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sir, I'm sorry. I'm going to have you speak into the microphone so they have the transcript.

MR. HAUPT: All right. I'm sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you so much.

MR. HAUPT: As far as the density, I've been told by staff members they're only using about eight acres to build on. If you divide 77 units by eight acres, we're up to almost eight or nine units per acre, not the two or three -- not the two or three that are being discussed here. So there's a bunch of falsehoods here. Mr. Miller needs to provide for and build his own ingress and egress road. At a minimum, he needs to provide entrance either to Ashford Place by connecting it to El Chaparral, which has been discussed, or building it across his property that he owns over to Ashland -- Richmond. This project is also unprecedented as is the desires and fabrications. This presentation is so mirrored in legalese that even one of our own City Council members, City Council members had to write this about -- had wrote this about it. From the description of the development, this is a town home development with three residents



per building. Each town home can be purchased individually and the land is included. So this is not an apartment complex. I'm sure some will be purchased for rental, but in my experience, these are an alternative for homeowners that don't want the yard work or perhaps would like smaller homes. Let's look at a few comparables. Kelly Farms over on Stadium and 63. Access road was built by the developer. They didn't require a bicycle -- they required bicycles. This project does not. They had -- also had to have ten single-family homes built between individual single family homes and the apartments that were being built. This project is asking nothing like that to be built. There's Legacy Farms out on Sinclair. Over there, you've got apartments, you've got Sinclair, you've got apartments, you've got a 55-plus complex, and then you've got homes 500 yards away from the road. Okay? Springbrook Apartments, brand-new, same thing. In other words, these projects are nowhere near to what's being presented to you tonight. Finally, several Planning and Zoning staff members tried to compare what is being proposed here at Ashford Place with the tri-plex units at Old Hawthorne. Please don't insult my intelligence, trying to compare tri-plex ownership in Old Hawthorne with this 77-unit Ashford Place apartment complex. That's what it's called -- it has to be called an apartment complex. I strongly urge you to turn down this proposal or require major changes before approving it and passing it on to City Council. Thank you. Any questions?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Darr?

MR. HAUPT: Yes, Mr. Darr.

MR. DARR: Why -- what makes you think it's not comparable to the tri-plexes or attached town homes in Old Hawthorne? I mean, you --

MR. HAUPT: Oh, no. No. No. No. Wait. Wait. Wait.

MR. DARR: -- they haven't been built yet.

MR. HAUPT: No, they're not. Have you been --

MR. DARR: I think these Ashford Place hasn't been built yet, so, I mean --

MR. HAUPT: Okay. Okay. Here. Have you been to -- what's the name of it --

(Multiple audience members speaking simultaneously.)

MR. HAUPT: Wellington Manor.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Folks --

MR. HAUPT: Have you seen Wellington Manor? Wellington Manor is an apartment complex with tri-plexes that Mr. Miller manages -- owns and manages. I urge you, sir, to go take a look at Wellington Manor, and I defy you to come up with any comparison whatsoever to Old Hawthorne tri-plexes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Folks, no. We're going to keep the level low so we can all hear each other. Commissioner Darr, are you finished?

MR. HAUPT: Mr. Darr, there's a huge difference. That's what I'm trying to say. And there would be a huge difference between what Mr. Miller is proposing, and what is in place now at The Brooks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very

much.

MR. HAUPT: Thank you, Mr. Darr.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next person? Next person to speak? Jump on up here. Come on.

MR. HALLEY: My name is Dale Halley; I live at 5250 Harbor Town Drive. I'm the retired mining engineer that's been pestering Mr. Kunz here, and he's been very gracious and put up with me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you get a little closer to that? I'm sorry.

MR. HALLIE: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. HALLIE: I've been pestering Mr. Kunz and he's been very gracious in answering numerous questions for me. Mr. Crockett this week has answered a lot of questions, and I think both of those gentlemen.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You're --

MR. HALLIE: Oh, I'm sorry. Normally, I'm really loud. Okay. So, Mr. Stanton, you asked a question about what is an alternative solution to this, and I've looked at the CATSO maps and El Chaparral should eventually be built from WW up to Richland. And if that could -- it could be developed from both ends to middle with the bridge done last, and then that would connect the whole thing, and at which point Ashland -- or Ashford could be completed. My concern is that it may never have a bridge across the creek. And I've looked at the CATSO maps. There is a major connector that goes through the middle of Hawthorne on the maps. There are several million dollars' worth of homes where that road is located on those maps, so it will never be built. That's my concern here is that El Chaparral will never be built. I hope it will because I know for a fact that everything to the north of us and to the west of us is going to be full of homes, and there's going to be a lot of traffic, And putting in El Chaparral first is the best thing for the entire community, the whole area, not just our neighborhood. And I personally don't have a problem with mixed use. I encourage it, so that's all I have to say.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next person to speak on this case? I'm looking for somebody to stand up. Okay. I see you.

MS. THOMPSON: Good evening. My name is Tina Thompson, and I live at 1223 Shore Acres, Columbia, Missouri 65201. I wasn't prepared to speak tonight. I wasn't going to speak tonight. I have nothing prepared. This is my first meeting I've ever come to. I don't know a lot of my neighbors. I don't have children. I live -- I don't have children who still live at home, but I do care deeply about my neighbors who I don't even know. I watch their children go up and down Hoylake on their bicycles. I watch them walk. I see families walking with strollers, and I sit out on my porch and I watch the traffic that's already on Hoylake. It's out of control already. People speed down there at night. I'm out on my back porch and I can see them go really fast. I see them go fast during the day. The reason I came up here to speak tonight with nothing prepared is because the speakers before me really touched me. And from what I heard, there is a way to build another access road, but apparently it's too expensive. That

really disturbs me. Does it disturb you? Because this decision is in your hands. So I just have one question. What's the price of one life? And more importantly what's the price of one -- the life of one child? Because it could happen, and I really truly believe that it will happen. There's going to be an accident. There will be, and it's going to be a child of one of my neighbors. So that's my question to you. What's the price of one life? Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight, ma'am. Anyone else to speak, please come forward.

MS. HOFMAN: Good evening. My name is Ashley Hofman; I live at 905 Sagemoor Drive. I don't have any prepared remarks either, but I did want to make a comment just of the observations on the conversation earlier. One, I think, Mr. Walters, you had asked about why the neighborhood didn't really expect, or especially me personally, buying a house on Sagemoor last summer, we didn't kind of anticipate that this was going in, and that's not true. We knew that those parcels were for sale and eventually would be developed. Columbia is a growing city. It needs housing. Those are ten minutes to downtown, so we knew that those would be developed to the north of us. What we did not expect was to be a connector, and the reason is at the end of Sagemoor and the end of Bethpage, I also believe Margate (ph) are cul-de-sacs. Those are rounded ends of streets. They don't just go and cut off. The sidewalks are curved. The curving goes all the way around. It's a cul-de-sac. We thought that those were dead-end roads, and that The Brooks was not going to expand anymore. The other observation I had, I think Mr. Darr you had asked kind of why we think that the Ashford Place is not on par with Linkside, and the materials that were shared by Troy Miller's team, the rental price was going to be around \$1,300 to \$1,800 per month for, I think, two and three bedrooms. If you go onto the internet and search for that price range, you can see that those homes have a lot of siding. Kitchens are not solid-surface countertops. It's not the same or comparable to Old Hawthorne of what people are buying there. And I will also just echo what Dale said, that I think that mixed use is a good thing for Columbia, that we do need more affordable housing, but that putting this Ashford Place higher density, lower -- it's more affordable than The Brooks, putting that behind The Brooks just doesn't make sense, that it needs to be closer to more thoroughfares and not attached to this neighborhood. And that is all. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Next person to speak on this case? I'm looking for someone to stand up. Okay. Here we go. You can come -- we've got a couple of chairs up here, sir, if you want to come up and go next. You're good.

DR. KELLER: Hello. Dr. Brian Keller, I'm at 913 Brockton Drive. I just want to address some things that haven't really been brought up is one, being on Brockton, that I would also serve --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you -- I'm sorry. You're very tall. Can you bend it up?

DR. KELLER: I am. Being on Brockton, that road would also serve as a thoroughfare to Hoylake -- I can't say that word. But it -- like so part of that would go through not Sagemoor, but the other road, and you could take across that to go towards Hoylake, which is, as we talked about, very busy, so people

would us that, in essence, to -- like, as one way to get on more access. And that road is not really designed for traffic. It's not bigger or anything like that. And, again, another thing to consider is the impact on WW. It's already an overcrowded two-lane road. There is no sidewalks because it's partly County land. You see people walking along it. There's -- like, even right now, there's not any places to walk. There's -- you know, you drive by the cross of someone who passed away. I don't -- before I even came here. So -- and just something to think about is also the impact that there's not really infrastructure there to support so much. You know, it needs to be built up before we add to much more because -- and Phase 3, we're not even complete. That's all I have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none.  
Thank you for being here. Next?

MS. BRYAN: (Inaudible.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: I don't think so. No. I'm sorry. Because we had some issues, you have to e-mail them in advance.

MS. BRYAN: (Inaudible.)

MR. ZENNER: That would have been in advance of the meeting, ma'am.

MS. BRYAN: I did upload them. I have a code.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh.

MR. ZENNER: Okay. Then they should be prepared for you here this evening.

MS. BRYAN: Okay. I'll go after --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. SHINN: My name is John Shinn; I live at 4408 Kingston Heath Drive. I also own the house at 4412 Kingston Heath Drive.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you get as close to that microphone as possible? I think they're having trouble hearing you in the back. Thank you.

MR. SHINN: Okay. So I'm a landscape architect by training, licensed in two states, retired. Former DOD, traveled all over the world. I've worked for the City of Austin, and I've been various multiple cities in this country and other countries. Nowhere does development get proposed that is, in fact, high density. They're proposing to put three units in the space of my house on the same lot size. That's three times the traffic regardless of what the traffic control studies say, I've never found one that's accurate. There is always more traffic than what they predict, bar none. The other problem I have, in reading a lot of the documentation originally proposed in 2010, 2017, and 2014, this should have never been approved in the first place. Even though it was one parcel, as you cited, there was also in that discussion and promises of a ten-acre park. There is no ten-acre park. When do we get a ten-acre park? There is also a connectivity tied into the MK Trail that was mentioned and is part of the requirements for these parcels, Parcel 5, that's now been broken up. So what happens to all that? When do we get that? Never. Money is going into coffers. He's giving the City money saying no, it's going to be built later. That diagonal road across the creek, Dale is right, it's never going to be built that way. You can't. If you've been down and

take a look at it, you would know. You're not going to do that, but I can tell you for a fact, oh, it can be built that way, but you're going to spend a lot more money going at a diagonal. I'm sorry. I'm very irate about this, and I do have letters into you regarding this matter. But nowhere do you put, and what is, in fact, I don't care how many they tell me it's not high density, it is higher density than a single-family lot versus three units on the same amount of space and three times the traffic. You have four cars per unit. That's going to be 277 times 4, times two times in and out, plus all the associated traffic with services and everything else. This -- all the previous designs for this conceptually show Hoylake connecting as an alternate. Hoylake was the alternate. The primary traffic was supposed to go over to El Chaparral. However, it got bought out, Brooks was developed, and then Hoylake was forced upon the developer to be built. Then Sagemoor was built. When they built Sagemoor, they should put the Sagemoor on the property line behind the fire station, with houses on one side of it, if the intent was to actually make it whatever classification you want to make it. City planners can recommend and the engineering staff can recommend all they want. The City decides things haphazardly on their own how they are going to classify a street. Per Ashford -- or, excuse me, per Ash [sic] Street is an example. Barbara Buffaloe is on record saying, hey, let's just change it, going against what the City engineers are recommending. Okay? I'm against this. Thank you for your time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, sir. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you. Thank you. Next person? And I don't know how they do the magic, but Mr. Zenner can help you. And are you speaking as an individual or --

MS. BRYAN: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MS. BRYAN: I just really like PowerPoint.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I made one on all of the stuff I've done to my house, so I'm with you.

MS. BRYAN: I made one convincing my parents we should get a dog when I was ten and it worked.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Nice.

MS. BRYAN: Awesome. Thank you so much. So my name is Jen Bryan; I live at 901 Sagemoor Drive. First, P & Z Commission, thank you for your time and your service to our community. So I specifically want to speak about the precedent this development sets. I know a lot of people have covered this tonight. Just in a quest to better understand what was going on, I did reach out to David because I'm a CPA. I hope to be an engineer in my second life, and in my third life, I probably would not be volunteering in P & Z. So, you know, as I look at this, I wanted to see if -- they're proposing this in our neighborhood, where does this exist? And I was given these examples which are Amberton Place received density near the main road, Bristol Ridge and Bristol Lake Villas, again, density near the main road, Bristol Lake Parkway. And then Old Hawthorne and Linksides, people have covered this one already today. I want to focus on the proximity to the arterial. Density is best located near a main roadway. Development, that being said, is eminent. I live on a -- I live in Phase 3 of The Brooks. It is

underdevelopment. I'm on a stubbed out street. I understand all of that. If we look at the broader context of our neighborhood, we see the land is owned by Garry Lewis, a mature developer in our city, and then there's also 240 units proposed at East Richland and Rolling Hills. So the need for Chaparral and these arterials that can carry all of this traffic that will happen as this side of town develops, it's so necessary. Right now, we believe this is unsupported density. There's concerns of traffic, the two spaces per unit minimum, you know, what happens if people have guests, service people come over. They use their garage for storage. There's persistent speeding issues on Hoylake. Sagemoor is a straightaway with a hill that crests. As mentioned, landscaping is minimum, climax forest, and undeveloped floodplain -- is that meaningful green space for a resident? A postage stamp lot by definition squeezes the maximum density in the possible lot. Less than 50 percent of the land is truly developable, and I'm going to look at that, 3.2 units per acre, it will feel like seven units per acre when we consider the way that the land is graded. Consistency builds trust. Within The Brooks we paid to have the Hoylake major collector become the CATSO major collector via the cost of our property. We're asking for similar treatment that the developer of this property also be held to similar standards to develop out, you know, the main arterials and roadways that exist in the area. Here's some ideas for a path forward. Again, many neighbors came up here and offered solutions. I'm not opposed to density in the right context. I'm not opposed to development, but we just ask that it be thoughtful. At a minimum, I would say right now, that is building those parking spaces, meaningful buffers, and maybe considering something that is a big more dense, but reduced into, like, R-2 cottage style, something that could let people attain homeownership at a lower price point. Thank you for your time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing -- oh, sorry. Did you -- no, you're good. Thank you.

MS. BRYAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next speaker. Next speaker. I'm looking for someone to stand up. Go ahead, Mr. Colbert.

MR. COLBERT: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Commission. Caleb Colbert, attorney at 827 East Broadway, here tonight on behalf of the applicant. And I want the Commission to ask themselves one question. Did any speaker come to the microphone and say that the plan that has been proposed is inconsistent with the Statement of Intent approved by the City Council in 2010? That is what this Commission is evaluating this evening. Does the development plan that's been proposed comply with the Statement of Intent approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council in 2010. As staff noted, the plan does comply. The plan is -- Mr. Crockett noted the plan actually improves upon the standards that are set forth in that 2010 Statement of Intent. I also want to respond to some of the comments that were made by some of the speakers. There were some comments or some suggestions that these were not single-family homes, and that's not true. That is just flat not true. Each of these units will house one family, and that family, whether they're a renter --

((Multiple audience members speaking simultaneously.))

MS. GEUEA JONES: Hey. They were very polite to you. Be polite.

MR. COLBERT: Single family attached is still single family. As a matter of law, single family attached can only accommodate one family in each unit, and that unit will be on its own lot. And that means in the future, that lot can be sold and it can be owner-occupied. But in any event, this Commission does not evaluate land use decisions based on whether the occupant of the building is a tenant or an owner. We have never made that distinction. Single family is single family whether the person living under that roof is a renter or an owner, period. That -- it is cut and dry. With respect to the density, we've gone over this. I feel like we beat this horse to death, but 3.2 density is an R-1 density. Mr. Crockett put the calculations in his slide show that show 3.2 is comparable to the Phase 3, Plat 3 of The Brooks, which Mr. Crockett was involved with. If you look at the plat that's attached to the development agreement, he signed and sealed it. So if anybody could talk about the density and the intent to connect Sagemoor to this development, it's Mr. Crockett. And you heard him say that it was always intended to serve this northern tract. You know, Mr. Crockett and I have to stand before this Commission over and over again. So when we talk about density, we have to back it up. We have to be truthful in what we say. Just because someone stands at this microphone and says that this is a high-density development does not make it true. Do the math. We've done the math. This is not a high-density development, and it comes in under the PUD 4 that was approved in 2010. I hope this Commission will consider the testimony tonight. I mean, really what's -- what the neighbors would like to do is relitigate the decision from 2010. I think when you consider that Columbia Imagined contemplates encourages a diversity of housing uses -- a diversity of housing styles in close proximity. It encourages a clustered subdivision where you have large sections preserved for green space. This meets that intention of Columbia Imagined.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Caleb.

MR. COLBERT: You can look at the Columbia Imagined, and this plat is an example of the type of development we should approve. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I have -- I have a question for you.

MR. COLBERT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I thought I saw in here somewhere and then I realized that I was looking at minimum lot size. What are we looking at for each of these units -- 1,700 square feet, 1,500 square feet?

MR. COLBERT: These are 1,500 square feet.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I know someone said it. I just --

MR. COLBERT: Thirteen to fifteen hundred --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thirteen to fifteen hundred square feet?

MR. COLBERT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. I -- yeah. Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Thank you. What is the distance between the subdivision and East Broadway.

MR. COLBERT: And -- pardon? And --

MS. WILSON: To get to the main road, what's that distance?

MR. COLBERT: I'll let Mr. Crockett come up here and address that, if you don't mind. Lawyers are not good at math, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: If we can wait, I don't want to start a precedent of having people come up more than once, if that's okay, but I'm sure that someone can slip someone a note.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. I can get it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else, questions for Mr. Colbert? Thank you very much.

MR. COLBERT: Thank you very much for your time.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's out of order. I'm sorry, sir. Next speaker for the members of the public to come up.

MR. ZENNER: And, Ms. Chairman, to answer Ms. Wilson's question, we're looking at roughly about 1,375 or so feet.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thirteen hundred feet?

MR. ZENNER: So just a little bit over -- a little bit -- a little less than -- a little over a quarter of a mile, if I'm not incorrect.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Are you coming forward, sir? Oh, yeah, please don't --

MR. WALLS: What was Ms. Wilson's question?

MS. GEUEA JONES: The question was how long is Sagemoor. Oh, that wasn't -- I thought it was from Broadway to --

MS. WILSON: That was my question.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. But that's Sagemoor; right? Isn't that Sagemoor?

MS. WILSON: I'm not asking specifically about the street.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I see.

MS. WILSON: But we'll get there when we get to Commissioner comments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Apologies, Commissioner. Go ahead, sir, whenever you're ready.

MR. WALLS: Jim Walls, 4757 Stayton Ferry Loop, Columbia, 65201. You see I'm walking with a cane because I just had a stroke, and I appreciate MU Healthcare saving my life. Appreciate that, and I'm originally from Missouri, but just came here from Texas, so we've played these games before. I kind of stand here confused as I, excuse me, following an attorney after I've heard the words from Mr. Miller himself say that these homes that they're building are rentals. They are rentals, and he is going to have them only for professional and semi-professional people. He's not going to make them available for college students or for Section 8, or anybody else. He's going to be very restrictive on who he gets there. And so as a safety and occupational health specialist retired DOD, and retired military member FMS, Navy, is he's confusing me when I say this because I went over to Wellington Place to see what he currently had. And as a sanitarian, I wasn't impressed, and I told that to Mr. Miller the other day when we had a meeting, that he doesn't comply with Columbia standards in the -- for the disposal of solid waste. He has an open dumpster where you get a cat in the face or a raccoon or whatever, and we are



complying because I have a trash can sitting outside my home that I can only put out there at a certain time and bring it in at a certain time. Now is he going to have an open dumpster over there, because I think the standards we're trying to maintain are good standards. We want the whole neighborhood to be good. But I'm a fear that this Ashford Place is going to turn -- excuse me, I hate to say this word -- it's going to be -- targets, it's going to be -- it's going to turn into a ghetto seriously, and you're going to have a crime --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, sir. Are there any questions for this speaker?

MR. WALLS: Well -- so one last thing I wanted to mention.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. WALLS: Seriously, I think Columbia, as a -- as a safety person, I think we're going to have a real bad traffic problem on WW at Sagemoor and on El Chaparral. I don't know if we're going to put a roundabout in there or you're going to put traffic lights in there or not, but we're going to have traffic fatalities at that place at -- on WW.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, sir. Yeah.

MR. WALLS: Thank you so much, people. I appreciate it. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next person to speak on this case?

MR. WAHEED: Shahid Waheed; I live in 60 --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you restate your name? I'm sorry.

MR. WAHEED: Shahid Waheed, S-H-A-H-I-D - W-A-H-E-E-D.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. You're going to have to pull this real close to you. You've got a soft voice. Thank you.

MR. WAHEED: Okay. Thank you. The -- (inaudible) -- behind my house. We felt -- build the house in 2019. There is a creek and there is a wildlife and all that, so it's against -- now, I appreciate the lawyer talking about it about 2010, but this is 2025. So -- and I know I respect the lawyers. They were the -- historically, they were the richest known royals in the Roman Empire. So -- and I have benefitted from this many a time. But 2010 and 2025 are two different things. They can build a road, and I think somebody said that the City -- I mean, I know we have rural America. The East and West Coasts calls us flyover country, but we should be more smarter than that. So let's prove it. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Next person to speak?

MS. RHINEHART: Good evening. My name is Aleece Rhinehart; I live at 501 Bandon Dunes Court. Thank you for letting us take your time this evening. We all want to go home soon, I hope. I am here as a mother and a neighbor. I have two beautiful children, and I have instilled in my oldest child since she was two to look both ways before she crosses the street. Hoylake Drive is the only thing that Columbia Public Schools can utilize for bus stops in our neighborhood. They cannot go anywhere else but Hoylake Drive. So no matter what, my daughter has to cross the street. And when she crosses the street, God love her, she just kind of does one of those I'm in the street, and then I'm looking both ways.

And I'm looking the wrong way because I don't know the direction of traffic. And so, it's too late, you know, for her. So I have to make sure -- I work from home. I'm a disabled veteran. I work from home. I have to make sure I'm at that bus stop with her morning and afternoon. And let me tell you, that traffic doesn't stop right now, and I understand that we are going to grow, and I want our community to grow. And when I say our community, I mean Columbia. I see homelessness all over the city and that is a concern to me, so I do want housing to improve for everyone. I'm a nurse by trade, and I do try to help people when I can. I just want to make sure my kids are safe from traffic and it's impossible. Right? No parent can keep their kids safe from traffic. But traffic-calming measures could help tremendously throughout our neighborhood. If we're going to propose, like -- I'm sorry. I don't know all the terms -- different -- like different types of developments in the different areas, I would appreciate, like, traffic-calming measures and different access roads before just utilizing everything through our neighborhood as it already -- Hoylake Drive is -- I wish you guys would just walk with me to the bus stop in the morning and the afternoon. Like, it's just constant traffic, and they're definitely going more than 45 miles an hour, even though it's a 25. And we can see that because we have those little traffic cameras or whatever that measure the speed, and I can take my kids for a walk and I'll look back and I'll just watch somebody drive right by one and they're going 55 miles an hour. And I'm, like, oh, my gosh. Yeah. Anyway, I'm sorry. I don't like speaking in front of people, so I'm just going to end with please consider other egresses out of the neighborhood, maybe doing, like, Phase 3 of the Ashford development with -- you know, first, and having it all go through El Chaparral and just, you know, maybe that would be better as opposed -- anyway. I don't have any solutions. I just want to make sure we try to work together as a community. Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I -- hi. I -- okay. So I saw and I know that David talked about this earlier, that you all are on the traffic calming list right now.

MS. RHINEHART: Yeah.

MS. ORTIZ: And I'm curious, have you lived there since 2022, or before?

MS. RHINEHART: No. So I lived in The Vineyards for, like, the last ten years, and then my disability came through the VA and I was able to move into a bigger house in The Brooks, which is a very nice neighborhood. But we noticed the congestion on WW getting a lot more dense because I used to live on -- in Andrei Circle, which butts up right up -- like, I was on the end of the cul-de-sac, like, I could see WW, and I watched The Brooks go in and I watched the development. And it almost got to the point, you know, when the roundabout was placed down at the end of WW, past The Vineyards -- I'm sorry. I really -- I can't remember. Yeah. On Rolling Hills Road, it's almost impossible for residents to get out of The Vineyards because there's no traffic light or anything, so sometimes when I would be going to work or something -- now I work from home, but it would be really hard to turn left or turn right, you know, on -- even getting out of The Vineyards subdivision. So anyway, I was grateful to be moving into a subdivision

where there was a traffic light there, you know, at the end of Hoylake, because it was, like, making it so much easier to turn right. But I'm sorry. What was the question.

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah. Okay.

MS. RHINEHART: So my point is, I've lived in this area for a long time. Right?

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah.

MS. RHINEHART: Was that what -- okay. But I moved into The Brooks in June, and then -- I now regret my decision, not because I don't like The Brooks or just because I -- I -- Hoylake Drive scares me to death. I mean, I watch other people's kids walk -- like, riding their bikes right down the middle of the street, and I'm, like, Oh, my God. If I knew that family right away, I would probably tattle on those children because I would worry that that would be my kid. And, I mean, my child is afraid to go outside by herself right now because we have construction going on around our house and there's dumpster divers. And I'm sorry, I don't know the right term for them. People that like to salvage and recycle maybe, and they go into the dumpster to get items. I don't mean any negative or derogatory. I believe in recycling. But it makes her nervous, you know, when she sees a stranger that we don't know, because we don't know everybody in our community yet, and I have to reassure her when she goes to bed at night that she's safe, that mommy is, you know, across the way, and that I will be there in a heartbeat, you know, to -- to protect, but I do wear a CPAP, so that might be really hard to get off in time to get over there. I'm sorry. Any more questions?

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. I'll just -- I'll just wrap up what I was trying to get out.

MS. RHINEHART: Please.

MS. ORTIZ: So it looks like your neighborhood or specifically Hoylake petitioned for traffic calming in 2022.

MS. RHINEHART: Okay.

MS. ORTIZ: I think that based on -- so the matrix for traffic-calming is available online, and everyone can access it.

MS. RHINEHART: Okay.

MS. ORTIZ: It's not the most up to date. Based on what David said, I believe he said it was 34 on the list. Online, it says it's 29. So that implies -- that implies probably that more projects have been placed ahead of yours based on -- there's a number of factors that go into it. But I think that based on the things that you and your neighbors have said, I think it would be worth, like, petitioning the City to say, hey, let's take another look at scoring this because the pedestrian score is very low. And based on everyone's input, I think the pedestrian score could be higher, which could move you up in the traffic management score sheet. I say that -- I care about traffic-calming a lot, so I just wanted to make you aware.

MS. RHINEHART: I appreciate the advice. I really do. Thank you so much, guys, for everything you guys do.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions from -- Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Commissioner Ortiz, what is that website so that these people can look it up and don't have to just listen to you, they can look it up themselves.

MS. ORTIZ: Oh, God. I'm so -- I like --

MR. STANTON: Did you just look at them?

MS. ORTIZ: Yes, I am here. So it's under Public Works, Street Division, Traffic Management slash Neighborhood Traffic Management. And then you scroll down and you go to Neighborhood Traffic Management Score Sheet 2023, last updated 2024, but I look at this a lot. So it's, like, kind of, like, muscle memory for me, but you can play this back later if you need to, but essentially, Neighborhood Traffic Management.

MS. RHINEHART: Okay.

MS. ORTIZ: Under COMO.gov.

MS. RHINEHART: I appreciate you. Thank you. I also just want to throw a question out there. What about schools for the future, like, middle schools and high schools, and elementary schools? I just want to throw it out there. Like, if we're going to add all this development, which we probably are, if we could just consider, you know, I don't want my second child, who is only two right now, to be in her elementary school and then, you know, because we're never going to be able to move now that we've bought into The Brooks. I'm sorry, we're not. So, yeah. But the -- you know, how they have to add, like, special housing -- not housing, extra groupings outside of the building, you know, that kids have to go outside the school to get to their classrooms.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. That will all come when it comes.

MS. RHINEHART: It comes when it comes. Okay. That's what I was afraid of. Thank you. All right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next person to speak on this case, please come forward. I'm looking for someone -- there we go.

MR. STEWART: Jeff Stewart, Ballyneal Court, 4912. It's the street with the swimming pool. She mentioned Hoylake in the traffic. If you're going to allow one ingress into this new neighborhood, Sagemoor is going to have the same issue and it's going to be tripled or quadrupled. There's going to be people, once that -- once it's built, and I have -- I'm really sorry that it's expensive for you to have to build an access onto East Richland Road, but you bought the property, and now you're trying to come through our neighborhood and increase traffic. And whatever the traffic surveys say, do one in your head. You know, you're adding all these units, and now all you're going to -- you're going to have all these people coming down this residential street. You could have one ingress for fire, police, so that's what I have to say. I don't know if you all had any questions about that or have thought about that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Are there any questions for this speaker?  
Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: If we're not to trust the traffic studies, we're just supposed to each individually do calculations and come up with capacities, or to go out there and live out there and drive. Or how do you

-- how are we supposed to measure the impact if we can't rely on the traffic studies to tell us what --

MR. STEWART: Well just -- just look at -- just look at common sense. You've got -- you've got one road.

(Multiple people from the audience talking simultaneously.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Folks, if --

MR. STEWART: You've got one road going in there with driveways coming in, you've got the 77 unit thing which is going to have three times as many people in there in these units, and they're going to all have to go out this one road, and all these people are trying to get out of their driveways. Where are these people -- I mean, I don't care what the traffic study says. Look at -- think about -- use your head. Use a little common sense.

MR. DARR: I understand what you're saying, but it's not a unique situation. I mean, every situation is unique in one way or another, but there are a lot of roads like Louisville. I mean, there's just a lot of roads that are neighborhood collectors that serve way more houses than Sagemoor serves or even will serve with 77 additional units on it.

MR. STEWART: Where?

MR. DARR: Louisville.

MR. STEWART: In Louisville?

MR. DARR: Louisville Drive in -- off of Scott Boulevard.

MR. STEWART: Off of Scott?

MR. DARR: That is the first one that came in my mind, but Thornbrook probably has a road that has as many.

MR. STEWART: Yeah. But Thornbrook -- Thornbrook has one road, and it's one neighborhood. What's the -- what's the adjoining 77 units --

MR. DARR: Well, so it's not the traffic, it's the type of development, it sounds like, you don't like.

MR. STEWART: No, I don't have any -- I don't -- I don't -- they can build whatever they want to back there. It's their property. They built it. But if they're not going to have -- if they're not going to have an access road, other than coming through a neighborhood and increasing traffic by fourfold, probably, then they ought to have another entry and exit. And I'm sorry it costs a lot of money, but you should have thought about that before you bought it. Well, obviously, you did, because you thought you could convince these people to --

MS. GEUEA JONES: All right. I think we're done. Thank you very much. All right. Folks, here's the thing. We've been at this for two hours, and there's still a lot of you who want to speak. If you keep making outbursts while other people are speaking, we're going to have to cut it off, and I don't want to do that because I want hear from all of you, but I can't hear the person who is speaking if you all are yelling stuff from the back. Okay? I'm trying to hear from everybody tonight. Okay. Who wants to speak next, please come forward.

MR. BIVENS: Nathan Bivens, 4900 Glide Cove, Columbia, Missouri. My wife and I moved into

The Brooks in 2020, but I think I have unique experience in this area because before that, we lived for 21 years in El Chaparral. So I am very familiar with how much traffic has grown on WW, and I've sat in meetings with that neighborhood association and city planners in the past, and we've raised similar concerns about traffic, being able to pull out onto WW from El Chaparral, and those are minimum requirements for line of sight on that road. And it's very hard to be able to get into traffic even just, you know, five years ago. But I've noticed in the last year, as we have more homes there, the driving and the congestion is getting, you know, much higher and the driving itself is getting more aggressive because of the amount of traffic traveling on that road. And I just don't feel that Sagemoor should be the only in and out for this development because right across the street is Rosetta Drive. And so you're going to have two roads coming out at the same point onto a very busy two-lane highway. And just this morning, I saw somebody coming out of Rosetta Drive who failed to stop at the stop sign, because if they did, they were not going to be able to get into traffic, and they did not want to wait. And I see this more and more, people being more aggressive. And so, for that reason, I just don't think it makes a good argument or a safe argument to consider that being the only in and out to this development. I think there has to be something else planned and put into place before all these units could go in. Thank you for listening to my comments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Next person to speak, please come forward.

MS. WEBBER: I'm Pat Webber; I live at 801 Sagemoor, just moving in.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you pull up a little closer?

MS. WEBBER: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MS. WEBBER: 801 Sagemoor. New resident, watching all this come down. And I -- we all knew that there would be development. Those roads were going to go somewhere. We knew that. You asked for suggestions. I would suggest an updated traffic study because it's a lot different from 2017. This is 2025. And all the traffic concerns do not correspond with the traffic that existed more than ten years ago. And the other thing that, you know, this whole high-density business, you know, this is not high density and all of that. Well, are they figuring it on the whole tract, but they aren't going to be building on that floodplain, so they're using the floodplain acreage to say this is not high density. They're -- they're cramming, and if you look, they're putting all the development just on that one area of this tract that they're developing. But they can't build on the floodplain, but yet they're using the floodplain; is this correct? Am I -- am I right in this, that they're using the whole floodplain acreage to justify the density? Okay. I mean, so they're building on X number of acres, but they're basing the density on X plus Y. So, once again, an updated traffic study, all this Hoylake business. And so we see what's going on at Hoylake, and we know that all those people who live in the new development, they're just going to get from here to there. So Sagemoor is a straight shot. It doesn't even have the curves or Hoylake. It's just a straight shot. So if, at the very minimum, I would like a stop sign at Sage-- and, oh, what the heck is

that street. I'm new. We need to slow folks down because all they want to do is get from here to there. They aren't residential in our stretch of the road. They just zoot, want to go, and there's nothing to stop them, nothing to slow them down. And those are my concerns. I really appreciate your time and your efforts because I know this is pretty tricky, but it's very important to us homeowners that we continue to have a safe, livable neighborhood. I wish -- I wish Mr. Miller well, but, once again, if you're going to have a development, you need to build your own road into it. Don't just lean -- I mean, is it -- is it normal to have that kind of an apartment complex cut through and use a residential neighborhood, single-family to get there? I mean, it's the only way in and out. So I worry about that. Thank you so much for your time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, ma'am. Any questions for this speaker?

MS. WEBBER: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Seeing none. Thank you. The next person to speak, please come forward. I'm looking for someone to stand up. There you are.

MR. FUDGE: My name is Carl Fudge. I live at 1107 Shore Acres Loop, Columbia, Missouri 65201. To me, this is nothing more than an infrastructure issue to where the infrastructure is not in place to support this. When you come down WW and you turn on Sagemoor, there's basically a spot for one car to line up to turn or traffic is going to be backed up all the way to El Chaparral, which is already a problem, and that's not more than maybe 50 yards. So when you come in -- this thing to turn left on Sagemoor, we're going to have a problem -- we're going to have traffic problems there. You're going to have issues with people trying to back out of their driveways, and like she said, they're going to get down that street and they're either going 35, 40 miles an hour to reach this. And then with the density, just like she pointed out, you can manipulate numbers. If you're going to build on five acres, but you've got another 15 acres of unusable land, you can claim my density is not as high because I'm not using that land. Well, you've still got -- the density is still there, you just conveniently use land that's really not being used to create a density number that's not what it really is, which means that the infrastructure really isn't the place. Then you talk about 77 units, or those other two tracts, what's going to go in there? This same type of properties that were in the 77 units, because that's what's there and people are not -- developers, and no one is going to want to buy a home near these apartments, so they'll develop more apartments there, which maybe we need them, but that's fine, we can have them. However, the developers that do these things need to come to the bat and put in the infrastructure in place to support the developments that they want to create, and not piggyback on somebody else's infrastructure to cause harm and undue safety issues to another community just because they didn't want to invest in the infrastructure for their community. That's all I have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Next person to speak on this case? I'm looking for someone to stand up or move. Moving works.

MS. DEHART: Hi. Christy Dehart, 4821 Stayton Ferry Loop. I just want to go on record the same as what they just said. The Sagemoor is going to be a problem. And when that's all backed up, where people can't get out of the neighborhood, they're going to start perusing through the whole entire

neighborhood to try to get to Hoylake where this stop sign is -- or the stoplight. So there's only one stoplight, and Sagemoor only has a stop sign. So that's going to be another issue. And so, I just wanted to bring that up.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Next person. Sir, I saw you in the back.

MR. STEVENSON: Bartley Stevenson, 7100 I-70 Drive Southeast. Thanks for everybody being here. Appreciate it. I think when the development was bought, there was likely floodplain in 2010, maybe when it was purchased, so they knew that would be utilized somehow, not for development. And I think if it's equal to or less or comparable to single-family homes, why not put single-family homes? If it's the same density, why not do that? It seems like it would be better fitting. When they knew that -- they knew there was the creek, they knew there was a floodplain, let's expand the subdivision, single-family homes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next person to speak? Anyone else? Last call.

MR. GRIMES: My name is Greg Grimes; I live at 4816 Kenora Drive. So during the informational meeting a couple of weeks ago with Mr. Miller, he did state that he was going to be the sole leasing agent for all of these units. After the meeting, I asked him what is to keep you from selling your interest at some point in time in the future? He had no answer for me. He might have all the good intentions of the world right now, but as we all know, homeownership and the pride of home ownership is very different than people who rent. There is a need for affordable housing in this community. I happen to know of one low-cost project which is going to be going in I think about a block and a half away from Hickman High School. That will be owner occupied. These are the types of home entry ownership that we need in this community. There's lots of rentals already available. Everybody here agrees that everyone should have the opportunity to own their own home. But what are going to be the controls on these rental properties? They may say there's only going to be one family per unit. How are you going to control that? The best intentions often don't work. In fact, there's an old saying the path to hell is paved with good intentions. So while we acknowledge that there is a need for affordable housing in this community, pride of ownership should take precedence. Given the opportunity, I would like the Planning and Zoning Commission to go back to the drawing board with Mr. Miller and say, hey, is there any other possibility of developing this same property with actual home ownership. There's been a lot of concerns about -- which are legitimate. I walk in the neighborhood every day, and I yell at people. I'm one of those old guys who yells at people to slow down. Every day it's only going to get worse. We are on Hoylake a connector between two sides, between Rolling Hills and WW. Think about this. Someone earlier asked what is the price of a human life, of a child. Before we jump to the end of this road, which is all good intended, let's think about this very long and hard. Thank you for your time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Ortiz?

MR. GRIMES: Yeah.



MS. ORTIZ: So if the -- okay. My question is, if these units were owner-occupied, the traffic would not be as bad?

MR. GRIMES: No. The traffic is going to be there one way or another if you're using the same amount of density. The numbers, based on the land usage right now, which has been established, that a larger plot is being taken into consideration to justify the amount of density. Okay? Lies, damn lies, and statistics. All right? We're fudging the numbers. However, the folks that own homes tend to take better care of them. They tend to have pride in ownership. We all understand there's a need there. God bless those people that can't afford a \$400,000 home like mine, but let's think about this, really and truly think about this. Is this what we want to do to set up a potential safety hazard within a neighborhood because I do not believe, and I could be wrong, but I do not believe that there are any other divisions where they are putting this type of housing unit development inside of an existing subdivision. Sagemoor is a narrow street. Hoylake, it's bad enough, and it's a fairly wide street. Sagemoor is a narrow street. You're going to be having trucks driving up and down for years. You're going to have additional people that really don't care because they're transient coming in and out. They're not going to be there. They have no pride of ownership. They're going to be moving in and moving out. They don't care as much. Okay? It's a safety issue, it's a development issue, and I think that we -- you -- it's incumbent upon you, as the Planning and Zoning Commission, to think about these things, what's best for all the citizens of the community. Does that answer your question?

MS. ORTIZ: Yes.

MR. GRIMES: Okay. Any other questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight, sir.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you for your time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak? Anyone else? Last call. All right. We're going to close Public Comment, and go to Commissioner Comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Where shall we start? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I've got a couple of questions for staff. Number one, the neighborhoods that most of our testimonies came from, they were part of a PUD plan. Correct?

MR. KUNZ: The Brooks is R-1, with the exception of the portion on Tract 5, so the northernmost portion of The Brooks would be the same zoning, the entitlements is this property, everything south of that which led to the extension of Hoylake is R-1.

MR. STANTON: So the Sagemoor is R-1. All that was R-1?

MR. KUNZ: That's correct.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: The choice of the developer to not seek greater intensity of development as a part of the annexation of the property. They saw that they wanted to do single family. At that point, we

were making a transition with the UDC to avoid planned district projects, and, hence, R-1 was the more compatible land use given what was surrounding it at that time, and that is why this is not zoned to a more intense zoning classification, or sought to be developed as a planned district.

MR. STANTON: Right. Okay. I say that to say this. Okay. So as I was listening to this testimony and I don't know, I've got some kind of old map or something. But I'm just listening to all this and I'm looking at -- this map I've got is old, like, the Sagemoor development isn't even on my maps.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: So I'm, like, okay, that was farmland, I see some crops, I see apex forest. So I'm, like, somebody probably thought the same way you guys did when they built your guys' stuff, because what I'm looking at is farmland. Were you ever a -- Sagemoor development, all of that was farmland is what I'm seeing. All of it. So the developments where you guys read it, all this is farmland. So I say that to say this. Developments happen. I have the same kind of angst about the developer. I don't know him. I've got him -- you know, I don't like to trust the human condition too much, so I'm kind of worried about that. But the mixed-use thing is also in the -- is also in the Columbia Imagined. I lived in a mixed-use environment. I'm an Army brat. My dad was a field officer, so we may have lived in a single-family home right by a whole bunch of duplexes, four-plexes, three-plexes, and that made me the heck of a man I am right now because I was raised around different income levels and different textures of neighborhoods and housing. Just because something is dense doesn't make it cheap because I'm very big on affordable housing, very, very big on it, and I didn't hear that word come out. And I think people that know me well did not say that, because they knew I was going to be on their behind if they did. So I don't think that these places are going to be much -- they're not going to be affordable housing. If you're thinking that you're going to get some kind of section, you know, I hate to use Section 8 type homes, all that, that's not what's going to go out there. It's not. I doubt it. Yes?

MS. GEUEA JONES: (Inaudible.)

MR. STANTON: I'll retract my time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. You're fine.

MR. STANTON: I'll develop -- I'll develop my thoughts more. Go ahead.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. I appreciate it. The way that they did this is in combined lots, but they would be sold potentially as condos because they're single-family attached. They're not -- they're not -- they're not designed as multi-family. They're single-family attached homes.

MR. ZENNER: These will be platted as individual lots.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right.

MR. ZENNER: As A, B, C, D lots. The D lot is the common lot.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. That's what I was missing on the plat map.

MR. ZENNER: But then the A, B, C will have interest in the common lot, so as an individual is sold an A, B, or a C lot, they would then have that interest. It would be similar to a condominium, but it is not a condominium.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. That's what I was missing on the plat map is -- is how that worked with the --

MR. STANTON: Like a row house.

MR. ZENNER: And then the land that lies outside of the D lot is the common land that would be the responsibility of the developer or a future established neighborhood association that would have to manage that at that point should the property be decided to be conveyed to individual owners.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And then Sagemoor is a private street or is it a public street? It's a public street.

MR. ZENNER: Sagemoor is a public street, publicly dedicated street as is -- are all the streets within The Brooks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: They have been accepted for City maintenance. So as a course of approval of construction plans, the concerns that have been expressed about who is responsible for improving or repairing Sagemoor, that will be addressed as a part of issuance of permitting. It may very well be addressed as a part of the development agreement that will be being -- that will accompany this project such that there is a set aside so the City is not holding the bag individually to repair damages that are done.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right. But it's not -- the HOA isn't paying for snow removal?

MR. ZENNER: No. It is a public street.

MS. GEUEA JONES: They -- really, they shouldn't be.

MR. ZENNER: Unless they've chosen to pay for that on their own. The cul-de-sacs at the end, if I can get to that while we're on the street's topic, those are offset cul-de-sacs. Yes, the sidewalk does go around them. That is an option in lieu of putting a temporary turnaround on property that was not owned by the developer, so they chose to put in the what would be referred to as an eyebrow that's not separated from the main line of the roadway, so that is not a non-traditional type of way of approaching the termination of a street intended to be continued. We have seen many developments where they have actually continued and blown through the end of a traditional cul-de-sac, which is even more frustrating to the adjoining property owners because that is a clear indication generally for folks that it was an intended terminal street. This was not intended to be a terminal street. Furthermore, pursuant to our development requirements, the applicant of the -- the developer of The Brooks was required, did not have a choice, was required to provide the stubs that are shown on the plat and shown within the public records. That was not an option. Our staff was insistent that those provisions be provided. That was the only way the subdivision would have been approved. I am one of the only members of our staff that was here when this project was approved. I am the only member of our staff that was here when Tract 5 was annexed into the City of Columbia. I actually was the staff planner that managed that. So comments that were made this evening are somewhat disappointing to hear. Staff was extremely conscientious in what was required based on the then circumstances that surrounded this development. We took great pains in

ensuring that we had a master development plan with a very detailed for that time development agreement.

MS. GEUEA JONES: To that --

MR. ZENNER: Hoylake -- Hoylake was not originally intended to be developed in the direction that it was developed, and the development agreement applying to Tract 5 and the Richland Road annexation actually had Hoylake continuing through Tract 5 to connect with an extension of Hoylake or El Chaparral, and it also included particular provisions that specifically precluded development of the backside of Tract 5 until such connection to El Chaparral existed with the approval of The Brooks, Phase 2. The completion of the traffic study, the development agreement that went with that, the road was formerly realigned by CATSO Coordinating Committee to ensure that the integrity of the road network plan was maintained. So this was not done haphazardly. There was a significant amount of effort taken to ensure that the road infrastructure was going to be taken into account, and based on the traffic studies that were performed at that time, and the regulations that we have in place, there was a requirement. It was -- the number that were provided, the assessments that were made, and the requirements of the Code indicated that the development of the upper tract that we are talking about this evening excludes the existing first phase was sufficient. And so as we make our decisions, we make those decisions based upon the information at hand, and that that we know. Now the connection between Hoylake or between WW to Richland Road, the installation of a roundabout, which was not originally contemplated. It was originally going to be a traffic signal at WW and Rolling Hills, that was replaced to a roundabout, and therefore, folks that are averse to those find a way to be able to avoid that. And that, unfortunately, goes through Hoylake. And with most traffic studies that are performed by the City's, there is background historical traffic incorporated into them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner --

MR. ZENNER: So that addresses, I believe, many of the questions as to the lack of our consideration of other factors, but we do have -- we have a variety of different things that we have done in order to ensure that the development of the overall area was accounted for before this project was brought in.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, no one on this Commission is doubting your staff's diligence.

MR. ZENNER: No. I -- the public -- however, the public is unaware of the efforts that have been done because most of them have not been here since 2010. And I think it is important that the public understands that we, as professionals, take our duties very seriously and we do our analysis very thoroughly. So that is -- that is the purpose for the explanation, and that is what I am trying to answer here for these folks. We have not just willy-nilly made haphazard decisions, and that's a term that was used this evening.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But to my question, Sagemoor is public?

MR. ZENNER: Sagemoor is a public street, as is Hoylake.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And the original SOI, as I'm looking at it for this lot was one family and one

family attached units or any combination of the same.

MR. ZENNER: That is correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Those were the questions I had. While we have staff's attention, any other questions for staff? Commissioner Walters, and then --

MR. WALTERS: Just a quick clarification. So Sagemoor, is it currently a 32-foot wide street?

MR. KUNZ: Correct. Yeah. Thirty-two feet of pavement, but -- 34 feet of paving, excuse me. Yeah.

MR. WALTERS: Thirty-four feet. So it's classified as a neighborhood collector?

MR. KUNZ: It was constructed to neighborhood collector standards, but is not classified as such on the CATSO major roadway plan.

MR. WALTERS: And the extension would be 34 feet, as well?

MR. KUNZ: That's correct.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I need several pieces of clarification, the first one being what is the practical result of a negative vote?

MR. ZENNER: I can't answer that question for you, Ms. Wilson. This project is otherwise compliant with the underlying zoning. The development of this property was restricted because it did not have access, and the access that was to be provided was lawfully authorized to be constructed in a different location and the connecting streets that provide access to this parcel were built by somebody else. Scott Boulevard was built by somebody else in order to gain access to the property that's now commercially developed at the corner of Smith Boulevard or Smith Drive, and Scott. There were millions of dollars poured into that that allowed that property to be developed with no developer contributions to the improvements to Scott. This developer could not get access to this property at this point because he would have had to have gone through two others. He does not have the right, or he has the right, he can go ask, but he's not under any obligation to build the extension of El Chaparral. He is not, by the Code, required to build a major drainage structure over the creek to get to his property on the north side of the creek so he could get to Richland Road. And he is not required as a result of this development to build a road on his own property. I mean, the regulations are very clear. I have Chapter 22 of our Municipal Code open, which clearly indicates that a developer is not required to construct a major drainage structure. A major drainage structure is what would be required to be built over the creek in order to support a bridge. What the developer is showing on his plan and what he is entering into a development agreement for is to assure that we have dedication of public road right-of-way, and we have funds by which to build the roadway when that roadway is planned on or incorporated into a capital improvement project that we do. We do our capital projects through a bond referendum every ten years. The ten-year bond referendum that we have -- presently in was improved, if I'm not incorrect, in 2023 or '24. So this

particular roadway will not be included in that. It would be potentially included in another. And as the comments have been made this evening with -- with full understanding and full agreement of those that have spoken tonight, the development impacts of this particular area are going to necessitate that the City take action in order to facilitate development of El Chaparral, back out to WW, and back out to Richland. Ultimately, that is going to be coordinated through development of the adjoining properties, which, as properties are brought in, as land becomes scarcer and development needs are made, that is how we build our roadway network. We do not, like most people would like us to do, build roads in advance of development. We unfortunately are reactive to that. We oversize or we will work with a developer to build roadways or at least prepare roadways for construction beyond what their development requires, and that is partially what is proposed for the extension of El Chaparral. The developer will build his local residential portion, and then we will come back in and we will complete the rest of that roadway with a capital project. And the whole idea is the developer's demands are initially addressed by his contributions, but he is also paying up front by dedicating all of the road right-of-way, which we will have and secure. Location of the bridge crossing to get to the north side of the creek, to get to Richland, has not yet been determined, so there is some flexibility in that, and that -- that's just the nature of how we have to do road planning. Our CATSO major roadway plan has conceptual alignments, and they do move occasionally, but normally, when those major roadways are required to be moved as a result of development, it does go through a very formal process. It's just not something that we decide in the office and say, well, today's the day we're going to move a major road. We have to look at the impacts of that. And Gans Road on the south end of town -- not Gans -- Phillips Farm Road on the south end of town is a very prime example of that. We went through multiple public hearings as it relates to how to run that road from Ponderosa Street all the way to the west to Rock Quarry Road. And so we've gone through a number of iterations, and I would imagine that we may go through a number of iterations with the other roadways that traverse the surrounding area in order to ensure, again, that we are going to be able to have capacity to handle the traffic moving from WW to Richland. So timing is everything. Development pressure results in that, not that this project will not create additional traffic in the short term. It will. However, we also realize that we do have plans and we have available developable land that is going to, at one point, be developed and have to build the infrastructure that is not presently there. And that is -- that's how all development occurs within our communities. Scott Boulevard existed for 15 years without being improved to where it is today, and we have an entire community built on the west side of town without a major roadway. We -- we had to deal with that. We had Vawter School Road existing the same way, and we have corrected that now, as well, and we are in the final stages of correcting that as you're west of Sinclair to Scott. So, I mean, it does take time. The public has opportunities for traffic calming, and I think the street that the one lady was speaking of as it relates to Sagemoor, given that it is not curved or doesn't have great deflection, as we refer to it, is the street that is at Royal Country is where the stop sign, there is a stub street that goes to the western property line, again a requirement, and that would be probably a location that would be advised in a recommendation, if that is your choosing, that

Public Works consider traffic-control measures there temporarily until maybe something else is addressed, but Rural Country is the name on that cross street that is about mid-point in Sagemoor. That would be the appropriate location.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'll go to Commissioner Gray, unless you've got more. Got more?

MS. WILSON: I did have more.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, please go on.

MS. WILSON: So the prior traffic study is 2017. It's almost ten years ago. What would trigger another traffic study?

MR. KUNZ: So any development that is proposed at point blank period was in Tract 5. We can - there is a stipulation in the development agreement that states that we can request a traffic study be performed again. So it could be done. The traffic engineer with the City did not determine it was necessary for this project. However, it is any development that's proposed in Tract 5 ultimately had a discretionary clause to allow the City to request a traffic impact study be performed.

MS. WILSON: And is that something that we can add?

MR. ZENNER: It's already in the -- so it's already -- the discretion of a traffic study, requiring a traffic study is already embedded in the development code, the UDC. It is also part of the 2010 Statement of Intent and development agreement that goes with the Tract 5 property, so there's not really a need for that.

(Multiple audience members speaking simultaneously.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Folks.

MR. ZENNER: What I would offer -- what I would offer as an explanation as to what may trigger a traffic study is if Mr. Lewis develops one -- develops the middle tract, so Mr. Lewis has the two tracts to the east, as Mr. Maher pointed out. If he decides to develop the middle tract that he has, and would want to use the extension that is being in Phase 2 of this project of Ashford Place to drive his traffic out through Bethpage, which is the street that it would connect to after he comes into the property for Ashford Place, that, potentially, would be a precipitating factor depending on what the density is. Ultimately, however, the connection back to, unfortunately, Hoylake, which is to where the connection is to the east, is what's going to be necessary in order for Mr. Lewis to actually be able to develop his property to any density, any level of improvement, because it's going to need two points of ingress and egress. And so we do have -- there are limitations that are going to probably create traffic impacts on the existing roadway network if other mitigating factors aren't taken into account. So crossing over from west to east to get back to Hoylake in order to distribute traffic at least out of the existing roadway network that is there again is part of a process of future development. And with each development, the traffic engineer is involved. We evaluate the impacts that that development will be bringing in relationship to the background traffic that is already within the development. Given we are ten years out, I would probably tell you that the numbers are probably stale, as many people have said this evening, and I think the next development that is coming in, I would probably, if I were a betting man, tell you that we're going to require an update

because the volumes of traffic that are now crossing Hoylake to get to WW have increased greatly, and that is from multiple different folded sources. Rolling Hills now runs all the way down to 63, runs from 63 all the way to Richland Road Grace Lane. That did not exist, and so as those traffic volumes have increased, that background traffic potentially and how it's distributed off of Rolling Hills between Richland to WW probably has not been adequately analyzed. So to what the public has said this evening, that is something that, yes, probably would -- would warrant something to be looked at, but again, the traffic volumes generated out of the 77 lots that are being created was not viewed as an issue specific given the development capacity of what Sagemoor has to it, and Sagemoor would be the direct ingress and egress out of this project, not necessarily Hoylake. And Hoylake is being addressed at least within the traffic management program, maybe not as expediently as the public would like, but it is being addressed. And that priority, as Ms. Ortiz brought up, may be able to be elevated given the impacts currently that are being felt, and I think that that is probably again an avenue that the public has to explore with our Public Works staff.

MS. WILSON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anything else, Commissioner Wilson? Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Thank you. I hopefully have --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: What was that question earlier because I never heard the answer.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry, sir. She can speak for herself. Thank you. Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: I have a clarification -- I have a clarification question for counsel about the criteria considerations for this decision. I know this is not a zoning decision. I just want to make sure that I have the list correct of what I am taking into consideration for this PD plan and preliminary plat.

MR. CRAIG: Well, as -- as staff noted, it's compliant. The criteria before this Commission is whether it is -- it comports with the Comprehensive Plan, and there's adequate infrastructure to support the development, and that's -- that's it.

DR. GRAY: That's it. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: That was my exact question. Where can I find that so I can just pull it up?

MR. CRAIG: That is Chapter 29, UDC, Article 6, Section 4, subsection N1.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: I had a quick question about, you know, the time delay for getting a traffic calming versus a four-way stop. Is that super complicated too if they -- I don't know -- as a substitute or a temporary substitute to have a four-way stop somewhere along Hoylake -- or more, one or two?

MR. ZENNER: I would imagine that is. What I will tell you is is four-way stops, after the adoption of the UDC, are discouraged just because of the -- because of other issues, they're discouraged. And we



do not normally -- in new subdivisions, you generally do not see four-way intersections. I'm not sure that we would have full stop control at the intersection, but on -- given the circumstances, I think, again, that is an issue that needs to be brought up with Public Works. We really do not have a -- we do not have control over that. You couldn't, you know, as it relates to comporting with the traffic management requirements, if the Commission -- and correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Craig. If the Commission wanted to make that as a considerable recommendation of the -- of the approval of this project, I don't think you can make it a condition that the applicant install stop signs on an existing accepted public street. That has to be approved by Public Works, and that's the problem. This is not something that -- Public Works in the City of Columbia own and maintain all of the streets within The Brooks. The process by which you get traffic controls or traffic calming is through our Public Works Department. It is not through this body. If it was something that was interior to the development that was being proposed, possibly, as a condition that you were going to do that subject to the approval of Public Works. But Public Works controls our public rights-of-way, and that's part of where the public needs to go and express their concerns, which I think this record will clearly encapsulate them, and we could share that with our Public Works traffic engineer and our director to find out how they would like to approach this. But we have to -- they're having to balance a lot of other factors, as you all are probably well aware.

MR. WALTERS: But is there -- is there a way or -- that their HOA could contact the Public Works and say we would like to discuss this with you further or --

MR. ZENNER: They're more than welcome to contact Jake Ray, who is our City's traffic engineer.

MR. WALTERS: Jay Ray?

MR. ZENNER: Jake Ray, and he could be contacted in the Public Works Department and Jake will take the phone call. Jake is one that knows, if I'm not incorrect, the evaluations, as well, for neighborhood traffic calming, and he oversees that program.

MR. WALTERS: All right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm just throwing out a head -- it seems like the Commissioners up here are trying to give you weapons to use. I hope somebody is taking notes. Ms. Ortiz gave you a website. Mr. Walters has given you the engineer. Play chess. We've given you the weapons to use to get traffic calming down to present those things to Public Works. Play chess. Play chess.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other Commissioner comments? Are we getting close to making some kind of motion maybe?

MR. WALTERS: I would make a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: And I think, to inform the public, all motions are made as a --

MS. GEUEA JONES: In the affirmative.

MR. WALTERS: -- in favor of, regardless of what you want. It's just the way we do things. So

regarding Case Number 231-2025, the Ashford Place PD plan Statement of Intention revision and preliminary plat, I move the approval of the request of a planned development plan, revised Statement of Intent, and preliminary plat to be known as Ashford Place subject to technical corrections and subject to an agreed upon development agreement prior to introduction to City Council.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion for approval made by Commissioner Walters, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Okay. Seeing none, Commissioner Stanton, when you're ready, could we have a roll call?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Geuea Jones, Dr. Gray, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Stockton, Mr. Walters. Voting No: Ms. Wilson. The motion carries 7 to 1.**

MR. STANTON: Seven to one, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Before we go on to the next case, I want to put on the record so that it is in the transcript that we, as a Commission, recognize that there is a problem on Hoylake. We have taken our time on this case to talk a lot about that problem, and about solutions that the community has tried to get for that problem, and I would hope that City Council and the Public Works Department will expedite that, as well as potentially a stop sign at Royal Country and Sagemoor as we move forward. Just wanted to get that on the transcript outside of the case. Moving on to our next case.