

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
May 07, 2026

CASE NUMBER 124-2026

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Grindstone Acres, LLC (owner), for approval to rezone the property from A (Agricultural) to P -- PD (Planned Development) and for approval of an associated statement of intent and planned development plan known as "The Retreat at Columbia," which would permit development of a 194 multi-family development on the site. The approximately 32.7-acre subject site is located around 350 feet north of the terminus of Gray Oak Drive, and is presently unaddressed.

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval proposed rezoning from A to E, and also to approve proposed PD plan and associated statement of intent serving the Boone area plat known as The Retreat at Columbia, subject to technical corrections and also subject to an improved tract split administratively prior to introduction of this case at City Council.

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

MS. ORTIZ: I received an e-mail about this case, but it was not clear their position. They expressed that they wanted to chat about it, but I did not take them up on that offer.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you for disclosing. Anyone else?

Seeing none. Are there questions for staff? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I notice that it says -- or you said that one letter was provided to Counsel Ward Representative. Is that new? I just don't remember seeing that before?

MR. KUNZ: No. The Counsel representative is always included in our mailing list. Yeah. Wherever -- whichever Ward the trap lies in there, they are notified.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Is that normally just not, like, written out, or --

MR. KUNZ: Maybe not, but it is the case that --

MS. ORTIZ: oh --

MR. KUNZ: -- they're always included in our mailing list.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Thanks.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Hi. Thank you.

You noted that there were no significant impacts in the traffic impact study. And I just want to clarify because I I went back -- now I am a fan of reading these. The difference in some of them is between, like, the designation of D going to E, or F to F, but in the actual, like, nuance of it, it is a delay of potentially, like, three seconds.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

DR. GRAY: So the question is, like, what constitutes, like, a significant impact to you in terms of your report?

MR. KUNZ: I would not be evaluating what would be a significant impact. It would be evaluated by our traffic engineer. But he did not note, nor did the -- the recommendations for the CDD and TIS know that there would be offset group as necessary for the impact screen by this because the drop in the low service, although it made him drop a letter, was not substantial enough in actual, you know, delay times, and capacity to create obligations for off-site improvements.

MR. ZENNER: And I believe, Commissioner Gray, you'll have an opportunity to ask an actual design professional who worked with the actual engineer -- traffic engineer for additional details as to how they are generally approached by our traffic engineers as to what constitutes that major impact requiring an off-site improvement.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky, did I see a hand?

MR. BRODSKY: I -- I don't think I've raised any concerns about our PUD plan, but this one I'm -- I'm struggling with a little bit, the need for the PUD. And I appreciate your last slide, you mentioned that, you know, there would be binding requirements that would be in place. Would those requirements not be binding upon the applicant and the -- and the developer as our city ordinance regardless?

MR. KUNZ: Well, if it were -- if it were open zone, if it were not PD, there wouldn't be a chance for anyone to review a site plan. What would be approved by the city would only be internally reviewed. Our thought process is that there's concern about the preservation nature of a scenic roadway overlay. And this gives people an opportunity to see what is intended to be developed where otherwise that opportunity would not exist if it were open zoned.

MR. BRODSKY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: Well, let me just provide a little bit of clarification so there's not a misunderstanding. We do review the site plans and we review them for minimum code compliance. Plan district development plans are often used in the process of ensuring that particular improvements that are believed to be in excess of what our regular regulatory standard would be are able to be adhered to and -- and mandated. And in this particular instance, improvements to the rock quarry overlay, which is really just a green field, would not be made possible. The understanding and depiction of the arrangement of the dwelling units on this site would not be generally locked in subject to a minor or a major amendment if it were not within a plan district. And so there are certain things, such as -- David pointed out, that the rock quarry special area plan does support the use of a plan district approach to give greater certainty. And in certain instances, that works both ways. We can assess that particular locations where we may have similar special studies that have been developing over time, but have not necessarily been developing in a PD. It may not have same -- the same environmental sensitivities or sensitivities in general, may not necessarily need to support that general objective. In this particular area, the nature of the rock quarry overlay is something that is still quite a significant element within the community. And following a plan district process, we believe is more appropriate to give assurances to those residents that are affected by development along this corridor and assurance of what will happen, as well as providing us a greater opportunity to extract particular things that just the standard development process does not mandate.

We can ask for anything in a regular straight zoning. The developer can tell us you're all wet. In a plan district, we can demand something because the plan requires it and they have to comply unless they want to come back through the regulatory process and have that eliminated.

And so, there's the difference between standard zoning and our plan district zoning. We have greater controls. We are like the commission in many respects. We prefer to not do plan districts, but in some instances, we do see that they still have value, maybe not the full value of what the code requires. But in this particular instance, when looking at all factors, we did feel this was an appropriate direction. David did not point this out. We did have a lengthy discussion about doing straight zoning. And just because of the sensitivities after our discussions with the applicant, they preferred to go this route just to ensure that there was more concreteness associated with the development proposal.

MR. BRODSKY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We'll go to public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT OPENED:

MS. GEUEA JONES: Members of the public wish to speak on this case, please come forward. You know the drill, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am. Madam Chair, members of the commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nye Fong.

With me tonight is Caleb Colbert. He's Hayden Colbert, representing the applicants, which is Landmark Properties. Also is Nirav Patel. He is our traffic engineer for the project. He can speak. He and Sean White were the traffic engineers. They can speak -- he can speak on behalf of any questions you have with regards to the traffic report that was prepared.

Also with us tonight is Chase Powell and Madison Whitaker with -- with the applicant, Landmark Properties.

As -- honestly, Mr. Coons did a very good job in his staff report here tonight, so you're going to see a lot of duplication, but I'll hit on the high points. Obviously, we're asking for PD zoning for 32.7 acres, which would include about 194 dwelling units. We'll have a mix of two, three, and four-bedroom units on the property, and the density's going to equate to about 5.9 units per acre. So when you look at standard densities and how that compares, 5.9 or less than six units per acre is -- excuse me, is not really considered high density.

So it's -- it's relatively moderate.

Again, the development will meet all the city requirements. And again, requesting PD zoning not due to the request, but rather to protect the area and give assurances. And I'll go into that in just a little bit. So we're not -- it's a lot of times we ask for PD zoning because we're going to ask for expanded building heights or other variances or other items that we typically wouldn't get in open zoning. And that's not the case here. As Mr. Zenner indicated, we did have a -- a good conversation about do we go open, do we go planned? And they asked us to go plan district, and we -- we agreed to it. You've seen our location map. You've seen our PD plan, and I think this is part of the reason why PD is appropriate. If you look on the right-hand side, up against Rock Quarry Road, there's a large area there that those dashed lines, that's our stream buffer. But on the east side of that stream buffer, there's a substantial amount of area that's developable. And actually, it's really good land to be developed.

However, in an event to try to do what we can along Rock Quarry, we want to preserve that area. We're staying away from there. If you see the little scalloped line, that's a tree line through there. So we want to preserve all of those trees. And so, while it is developable, while it is, you know, good development ground, really, we just want the three small duplexes there and leave the rest of it alone. That's kind of a buffer up along Rock Quarry that helps preserve that. Not just the -- the -- the hatched area, the 83 feet, but there's acres there that will be left untouched.

So to your point, Mr. Brodsky, if we had open zoning, there's no assurances that we would stay out of that. And so having a planned zoning district gives everybody assurances that we can't touch that without permission being granted by the -- by the P&Z and ultimately council. So that's part of the reason we want to go plan zoning is that we can stay out of that area, which is very important.

The green space on the property, you can see we have substantial amount of green space. The hatched -- the hatched area, that's our climax forest that we're preserving, two and a half acres, but there's much more than that. Then that's not really showing it's in the light green area. And also keep in mind that the climax forest doesn't include all of the mature trees and all the mature forest that's in the dark green. That's our stream buffer area that we have to preserve. So there's a substantial amount of vegetation that's being preserved on this piece of property. The SRO -- SRO overlay district, we've talked about that just a little bit -- David talked about that in the staff report. Here it is here. So you can kind of see, you know, the piece of property, the -- the hatched area is the preservation area that -- that we need to preserve. And the -- the dashed line, that's the limit of underground utilities, signage, lighting, and have other provisions included there.

This is what it looks like. And so that's not really the intent, I don't believe, of what the overlay district probably was. I don't want to speak exactly, but, you know, if you look at much of Rock Quarry, there's mature trees all along the whole roadway there. And that's not what we have here. Right here we have basically just an old pasture. And so the intent there is let's -- let's try to reestablish that. Let's come in here with some landscaping. It'll add some screening. It'll also try to get that intent of what we believe that the scenic overlay district is protecting. Let's get it kind of started here. Now, is it going to be a full mature forest day one? No, but we have to start somewhere. And so that's what we want to do.

Again, the traffic -- traffic study was done for the development. And again, traffic was performed at the request of the city. And how that works is that the scope is defined by the city and MoDOT. They tell us what we need to look at. We don't tell them what we're going to look at. They tell us what we have to look at. And our traffic engineer does the work and performs the traffic study and then submits it for review and approval. And that's exactly what's happened here.

Mr. Patel can speak on that if there's any questions about it. But the traffic study identified no needed offsite improvements and the city and MoDOT have agreed to that. And so, we think that's important.

Utilities, obviously they're all there. And if you look at the utilities and how they were constructed, substantial amount of investment and capital has been put into this area with regards to sewer and water and electric to serve this area. And it's not the Walmart. It's not the development further over. It's this undeveloped area all along Rock Quarry Road. Columbia Imagine identifies this as a neighborhood district. It's located inside the urban service area. And what does that mean? It means water, sewer, electric, and roadways are available to serve the site. And again, as -- as Mr. Coons indicated, it's a tier one growth priority area. It's the highest priority area for future development and redevelopment. Utilities are available. It's considered infill, encourages higher density, and it's preferred focus for development for the city of Columbia.

So in conclusion, real quick, I think I touched on the bases. We're requesting PD over RMF for protection purposes. We believe that's appropriate in this location. And we don't ask for it very often, but we think that it's appropriate at this particular project.

Proposed plan not only complies with the SRO district, but we believe that it enhances it. It makes it a better situation than what's out there right now. Utilities are available. The traffic study was completed. It's in conformance with Columbia imagined. It complies with the UDC, and it comes to you with

staff support. So, with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

Any questions for this speaker?

Commissioner Darr?

MR DARR: To get nerdy with civil engineering, kind of.

MR CROCKETT: Yeah, that's it.

MR. DARR: Since it was brought up in the report about the BMP, and the stream buffer, so this site, to me, looks like there's a drainage channel on the east and west kind above this development.

MR CROCKETT: Yes, sir.

MR. DARR: And one has a stream buffer, and one doesn't. And although the one on the west has a larger drainage area, it seems to be a more defined channel --

MR. CROCKETT: You are correct.

MR. DARR: -- on the east.

MR CROCKETT: You are correct.

MR DARR: So -- and then I was looking at the table and what's allowed, a flood control is allowed in inner zone, but BMPs are not. Is that why City Staff is telling you that you can't have that BMP there.

MR. CROCKETT: It's my understanding that -- that flood control is allowed in the outer zone, but not the inner zone, if I'm not mistaken. That was the information that was provided to us.

MR DARR: Okay.

MR CROCKETT: And so, we're evaluating that a little bit more, but at the same time, we've done a preliminary grading plan on this, Mr. Darr, and the site basically grades from east to west. And so we can put it into our detention facility that's going to be on the west side of the property.

MR. DARR: Okay. Very nice. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any questions? Is there -- is there a reason that you connect to Rock Quarry?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. We would need another connection for remoteness for the fire department.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it.

MR. CROCKETT: So they're going to require another way, another ingress and egress. They require -- when you talk about remoteness, that's a -- that's basically a dimensional standard. How far apart, and not only how many entrances do you have to the development, but how far spaced --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: -- that they are.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I thought that might be the case.

And is this just a -- and maybe this is better for one of the other folks here with the applicant tonight. But is this a general housing development or?

MR. CROCKETT: Is this -- this is a purpose built student housing.

MS. GEUEA JONES: This is student housing?

MS. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Seeing none.

Next speaker on this case, please come forward. Anyone, don't be shy.

Just as a reminder, name and address for the record. I allow six minutes for group to speak.

MR. RIEBACK: My name is Marty Rieback. I live at 1711 Rieback Road. My family's lived along Rock Quarry Road for 80 years. My family was very influential in establishing the scenic overlay, and we were very concerned about maintaining the character of Rock Quarry Road. I feel that we should oppose this development for three reasons. One, it's bad for the city of Columbia. This is an out-of-town owner, an out-of-town developer, and they will bring in all of the labor and all of the materials to build this, and Columbia will not economically benefit at all.

The student housing is not residential housing. It is not -- it's only good for students that want to rent one bedroom in a suite, which is single use. The other reason is it's bad for Rock Quarry Road because although the traffic report shows not that much traffic at the peak times, the traffic is horrendous, and I would strongly suggest that you put in barriers and not -- and -- and -- for early morning and late rush hour that you not allow any traffic onto Rock Quarry, but they have to use Grindstone Plaza, only emergency vehicles. That would only be for two or two and a half hours a day.

Thirdly, I would oppose it because it's bad for the wildlife. This is a unique area that connects with the Nature Conservancy area and Grindstone Park and my 70 acres, and it is rich in wildlife, and by putting

this in, you are cutting off that circuit that -- and when you reduce the amount of habitat, the animals don't just move closer together. You lose the wildlife. Any questions? You lose that, and you lose the wildlife. Any questions?

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

Next person to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. DAVIS: Would it be possible to bring up one of the screens that the city had up, the one that shows the three tracks?

MR. KUNZ: Yes. Gladly.

MS GEUEA JONES: Very good. Name and address for the record while he's pulling that up?

MR. DAVIS: Tony Davis, 4655 Rock Quarry Road.

Supporting what Marty was saying that this is a student housing development and not a residential development, and I want to add some numbers to that for you. There -- this plot, as you will probably see, will have about 720 parking spaces, which means roughly 720 cars, and approximately that many rooms can be leased in that area, and even though the traffic study, which I think is woefully short, but what was there, the -- the study was not done at, any -- any study at all at Stadium and Rock Quarry, which is where all the traffic ends up, and every morning, there was no traffic study done in the morning at any intersection, but every morning at that intersection, if you travel in about an hour, given 8:00, one side or the other, it can back up as much as a half mile that goes back around across the bridge and back up the hill.

Adding more traffic to Rock Quarry Road is definitely a problem, and we need to address that before looking at approving this development, I think.

I think that the -- the neighborhood that this designated as a neighborhood because all of us would like to see more affordable housing, this could be our one, and I think it's already been addressed by Mr. Crockett, that it's about the same number of people that would be there, but the people would be dispersing different ways if this were given a different zoning. By planning and zoning, they could go east, west, north, or south. Right now, there's a road proposed that comes out onto Rock Quarry Road, and that road, it will be the primary road because since it's student housing, that leads directly to the campuses in the center of town.

The people coming in and out of Rieback Lane kind of forget about that in the morning and in the evening whenever this traffic is there. So that road definitely is something that just shouldn't exist, but I understand it would need to exist if there's some type of development or housing development there for fire protection and other reasons, but to add any traffic to Rock Quarry, and there'll be another presenter, I think, that'll give you some information about how deep the drop-off is in various places, and the picture -- one of the other pictures that you saw, it had all of the fence there, but if you drive down Rock Quarry Road, the -- you can see where many cars have run off and gone through the fencing area. That won't change.

I was also a member of the scenic road that was adapted in '98, I believe, even though we worked on it many -- much before that. I was also on a committee that met for about a year and a half to improve Rock Quarry Road, but that was -- and understandably, far too expensive --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MR. DAVIS: -- to put bike lanes, curb and guttering to do that. So I'm --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, sir.

MR. DAVIS: -- to some degree, I'm representing an organization which is the Scenic Overlay, so let me just make kind of a final right here.

MS GEUEA JONES: No, I think -- official representatives, I'm sorry. But let me see if we've got any questions for you. Give me just a second.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. All right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Thank you. I just want to clarify. What kind of development would you support in this area?

MR. DAVIS: I think that -- that a development where you don't, by definition, put all the traffic back out on Rock Quarry Road, it simply cannot sustain it. We have many accidents already. There needs to be -- I'm not sure what it would be, but there needs to be changes in the road structure and infrastructure before you could add something like this planned development. I think it's a great plan, but it's in the wrong place.

Also, we don't know, as part of an answer to your question, what's going to happen in track two and track three. Look how large those are. So as a planning and developing organization or group that really represent us, the community, that needs to be looked at in whole before we accept a planned development that we know what's going to happen. I can see where the city would approve it because it checked off all the boxes for a planned development, but not to be put in that location. Any other questions?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Gray, did that answer your question?

MR. DAVIS: Did -- did that?

DR. GRAY: I'm curious if this were 194 units of non-student housing, would you be in support of that?

MR. DAVIS: I would think that if -- if it were considered -- this is called student housing, but it would still -- if it were apartments, I -- I -- I would be in opposition to that. I would not be in opposition to R-1 --

DR. GRAY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: -- okay?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other?

MR. DAVIS: And that would be, you know, better housing for the community.

DR. GRAY: Okay.

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

MR. BRODSKY: I just want to clarify. The reason that you would support R-1 and not student housing is because if it's student housing, they're going to be going north on Rock Quarry towards campus, where as if it was R-1, a smaller proportion of traffic would be going towards campus. Is that -- that your logic?

MR. DAVIS: Yeah. That's -- that's a lot -- so some changes in road structure. That would even need to be done for R-1 to help manage traffic. I would not support any development that puts any more traffic out onto Rock Quarry Road. There needs to be -- I don't have that answer, but there needs to be improvements, and it's a very difficult road. That road is over 200 years old, and it's remained the same footprint in all of that period of time and it's just been improved, improved. You know, it has quite a drop-off.

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

Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward.

MS. DAVIS: My name is Barbara Davis.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you pull that down?

MS. DAVIS: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MS. DAVIS: My name is Barbara Davis, and I reside and I reside at 4655, excuse me, Rock Quarry Road. Excuse me. I've been there for 46 years, and I'd like to address the safety of Rock Quarry Road. And if you don't mind, I have printed out an article that (inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, ma'am.

MS. DAVIS: This is my first time, so anyway, I have borrowed extensively from this article, which I found very helpful, so I'll begin.

About four times a year, Ted Stevenson repairs the fence on his property along Rock Quarry Road. The reason is because drivers often lose control of their vehicles and crash into it. The Rock Quarry Road, or Rock Quarry Road, is a snaky street that extends more than four miles from Stadium Boulevard to Route 163, but it's the northern portion of the road, about a 1.7-mile stretch between Stadium and Grindstone that's considered one of Columbia's most scenic and most dangerous roadways.

Although it provides picturesque scenery, the road is notorious to Columbia residents for being dangerous to drive on. Between 20 and 24, 358 total accidents have occurred on Rock Quarry Road, according to emergency response calls to Boone County Joint Communications. Stevenson, whose property runs along Rock Quarry just north of Grindstone, estimates that 40 or 50 accidents have occurred near his property alone. There's a 10-inch drop-off on the side of the road next to Stevenson's property. There is no shoulder, so once a driver veers off the road, it's impossible to correct, said Stevenson. Stevenson said that a city official brushed off his concerns telling him that there shouldn't be issues along his property because the road is straight.

He, along with other Rock Quarry residents, have brought their concerns about the road to Columbia City Council, asking it to upgrade the road with curbs, gutters, or guardrails to prevent future incidents. In January of 2022, Caleb R. Wheeler, age 24, died when his vehicle went off the road and struck a tree. John Martin, age 26, died in a motorcycle accident on Stevenson's property in October of 2023. This is the quote, how would you like to be a parent, which I am not, and receive a phone call between 10 and two in the morning saying, this is Columbia Police. We'd like to tell you that your child or spouse or relative is in the hospital and has had an accident, Stevenson said. That basically happens two or three times a year just in front of my property.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, yes.

MS. DAVIS: Oh, shoot, okay, thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for the speaker? Thank you for bringing that to us in print. That's helpful.

Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here. I'm --

MS. DAVIS: Very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry, ma'am. I know we've got it on the transcript, but will you say your name one more time, so I can write it right down here?

MS. DAVIS: Oh, I'm sorry. My name is Barbara Davis.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Ms. Davis.

Any other member of public to speak, and I believe we've got at least one -- perfect, Mr. Patel.

MR. WILSON: Good evening, members of the committee. My name is David Wilson. I live at 1810 Rieback Road. Rieback Road is directly across from the egress onto Rock Quarry Road. I've lived there for 20-something odd years now, but I also grew up in the neighborhood and I spent most of my life on Rock Quarry Road.

I'm not here to talk about the road per se. I'm kind of a risk taker. I like the thrill of driving on Rock Quarry. I am here to talk about the planned development versus residential. I actually spent some time working these meetings up in the booth, shout out to the folks on camera up there, back in the PUD happy days of 2000 or so, when we wanted to make a lot of PUDs and we really wanted to sculpt these things. And so we have a lot of examples of how this worked out. And one of them is just up, just north of here on Rock Quarry Road, it's Rolling Rock. Rolling Rock came to the neighborhood and they basically threatened us. They said, look, if you don't approve our PUD, we'll just go R1 and we'll do whatever we want. And the fact is they wouldn't have because what they wanted to do was make single room student housing just like this.

And to answer your question, Commissioner Gray, I would love to see infill development in Columbia. I would love to live across from a neighborhood here. If this was R1, that would be fantastic. If this was -- if this was even apartments that addressed families and the need for that kind of development, that would be fantastic. And I think it's a little disingenuous, no offense, but when the staff says that this meets a goal, it doesn't. The goal is very specific in the city's own report that that goal is for residential, not student housing. The city's report says we want residential housing, not student housing to meet those increased goals. So this is failing to meet that as a development. I can quote if you like, you look skeptical, but let's see. When the housing says the larger housing gap is for residents, not just students, while development continues to meet demand for University of Missouri students, there is a growing gap in housing options for full-time residents. That's what we're missing. That's what this land could be for. It's great to have walkability to the commercial just south of there. There are road issues, of course, as other people have said, but what we need is not additional student housing that's built for 20 years by out-of-town developers. I can take any questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

Mr. Wilson, would you indulge me with a little bit of back and forth? Because I don't think the issue is the identity of the students. I think the issue is the structure of the housing. So can you tell me why there's a difference for you between apartments and student housing?

MR. WILSON: Well, sure, I could speak clearly about R1, which is what I'd love to see there, right, where you can't have more than three unrelated individuals. R1 is built for families. I believe that's still right? Am I wrong? Did the ordinance change?

MS. GEUEA JONES: It -- that's not exactly true. If you are an owner-occupier, there is no real requirement. But I'm more thinking about for -- when I hear student housing, I think about the suite style --

MR. WILSON: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- setup where you rent an individual room, and there's a common living area versus an apartment complex where there might be four bedrooms, four people might live there, but it's a shared household, and if they moved out, a family could move in.

MR. WILSON: There are so many functional differences between how a family occupies a unit than how a group of unrelated students occupy units. And we can -- again, we have plenty of examples to see how this works. It works in terms of traffic; right? In terms of where people drive in the morning and in the evening. They work in terms of parties and whatnot. And, frankly, they work in Columbia and in other college towns in terms of how out-of-town developers see the short-term economic benefits and not the long-time residual effects. Most of these units that I've seen are built for 20 years; right? After 20 years, they've gotten their money out, and they don't care anymore.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So I don't think I'm being clear with my question.

MR. WILSON: Okay. Sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: My question is, are you concerned about students living there or are you concerned about the structure of a housing complex that's built for students?

MR. WILSON: I'm concerned about the suite-style structures that rent by the room and are marketed to students.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So if it was an R1 development that --

MR. WILSON: Great. Bring in the students.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- had a bunch of students living there --

MR. WILSON: Yeah, of course.
MS. GEUEA JONES: -- don't care?
MR. WILSON: Yes.
MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.
MR. WILSON: Happily.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Because I think sometimes when we hear people talking about the identity of the people that might live in housing, we kind of go hmmm, but I don't think that's what you're saying. That's why I want to get clarity.

MS. WILSON: We're close to campus. Thank you. Thank you for clarifying that. We're close to campus. Of course this would be a great place for students. I'm a landlord in our neighborhood. We rent to some students. It's not the tenor of these kinds of developments. And I think this development is wrong for that area.

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

MR. WILSON: One very, very quick point about the --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead.

MR. WILSON: The point about the -- the traffic and the traffic study and the impact, and we are looking at three sites here. And we are looking at three sites here. We're only talking about one, but triple any of those numbers. And that's what we're really talking about. So anyway, thank you very much for your time. I appreciate it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you Mr. Wilson. The next speaker on this case --

MR. BENBOYLE: My name is Joseph Benboyle.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, wait till you get to the microphone, please. Come on up.

MR. BENBOYLE: You couldn't hear me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, I can, but the recording can't. And then I get yelled at and told I'm not doing my job well.

MR. BENBOYLE: I understand. Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Please go ahead.

MR. BENBOYLE: My name is Joe Benboyle. I live at Rock Quarry and Rhinestone. I've lived there for about 47 years on and off, off Rock Quarry Road within 300 yards. Just a quick notion. I represent the group, and we are trying to make a cogent presentation here. We're on very short notice on this. We just got the traffic study here just a couple days ago. Staff sent it as soon as we asked, but we didn't know to ask. So I apologize.

Would -- could I be indulged with six minutes rather than just the three?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead.

MR. BENBOYLE: Objection? Thank you. This is a boutique student housing development.

The price of these rooms will not be covered by any families moving into these -- these type structures. That is not a knock on these type developments, but don't think that we are addressing affordable housing. Don't think we are addressing fair housing policy across Columbia when we build this kind of housing. I think it's clear that this is a massive development. The infrastructure in this area has been looked at in a number of different ways and commented on. But safety is my main concern. This is -- could be up to 200 units, 720 beds, 731 parking places. The traffic study that is -- that anchors the whole safety issue calls Rock Quarry Road a major collector. And if you look at the plans that the city has made, it's called a major collector. That is true. But if you look at the definition of a major collector, and when you guys do your job as far as what kind of development goes where in terms of what kind of road infrastructure is available, a -- a major collector has to be a minimum of 36 feet wide, have 12 foot --

two -- two lanes of 12 foot -- feet each with a shoulder and sidewalks. That is not what we're looking at with Rock Quarry Road north of this development to the university where all of these people are going to -- are going to -- are going to have to transit. It's not even close. Rock Quarry Road is in shambles. here are many feet of, I'd say, two to three feet in some areas where if you go off that pavement, you're -- you're -- you're in very, very serious safety trouble. The trees are very, very close. That's number one.

The traffic study rightfully, frankly, assumes that designation. But the fact is that the road out there is not that. If we were building a new subdivision, if we were building a new area, we would have a much, much, much larger road to handle anything like the -- the traffic volume that, frankly, is out there now. But let's go back a little bit. The city established the scenic overlay, 83 feet to preserve the natural scenic quality, only one in Columbia. It's a very significant designation.

But more importantly, in 2024, the council decided not to improve Rock Quarry Road, not to improve this collector. It was going to cost \$13 million to bring this road up to major collector status. That was 15 percent of the entire 10-year capital budget for the city of Columbia.

We support the decision to not improve Rock Quarry Road to that extent. But that's what should -- could have happened or should have happened if this type of development should go forward. We think the traffic problem is a very, very serious public safety issue, not just for those students, but all of the students and all of the residents that are going to be moving into all of those apartments that are off of South Hampton, down by Veterans United, on Grindstone Parkway.

There's going to be a lot more traffic on this road, whether or not this development goes through or not. So this -- this is a very serious issue. Well, how does -- how does the developer address that? The traffic study came to the conclusion that there were 2-second and 30-second and 50-second delays in some of the lanes going in some of the directions to the south in the commercial area. What is not in the traffic report is what the delays are at Stadium and Rock Quarry Road.

The -- the -- the peaks that -- that -- that were chosen, and as I understand it, the peaks were blessed by MoDOT or by the city in some fashion. But the -- the actual peaks that were studied in the counting were between 11:00 and 2:00 in the morning and 3:00 and 6:00 in the afternoon.

Well, the fact is, and everybody who lives along this road, myself included, can tell you the peak in this section of road is at about 7:30 to 9:00, 7:30 to 8:30 primarily. And it's because, not because of the university, but the hospitals. The hospital complex opened at that time. The traffic now at Stadium and Rock Quarry Road is a quarter of a mile -- half a mile backed up. Now, that's before we put 700 cars. Now, there's suggestion that there's going to be buses that are going to carry some of the -- some of the students up there, and that's fine. But those buses are of a pretty wide dimension. They alone are a little bit more of a risk than individual automobiles anyway. At any rate, the peaks were missed in the study. We just got the study a day or two ago, but the peaks were missed. This commission should require that those counts be done during the period of time where the actual peak takes place. It does not take place between 11:00 and 2:00 some of the. And students that have to hit 7:40 classes, 8:40 classes, 9:40 classes, that was missed in this study too. They didn't start till 11:00 to even start looking and start counting.

We are not -- the 358 accidents in the last five years when the article that Ms. Davis was referring to, 358 accidents on Rock Quarry Road in the five years before that article, which was in 2024. That's a lot of accidents. It's not going to get any better. And the council has decided that we're not going to improve Rock Quarry Road to major collector standards. They're not going to do it, can't afford to do it. The topography, it would be impossible to do it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, let's see if we've got some questions. Any questions for this speaker?

Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: How close were you to your final thought, in your final thought if you can --

MR. BENBOYLE: I -- I would ask that this commission delay this development or recommend delay of this development until -- until we can take an accurate count of the traffic that that is going northbound on Rock Quarry Road up to Stadium and analyze that -- that intersection as carefully as they analyze the commercial portion of this -- affected by this development, which is south. There's -- Grindstone's a four lane, totally controlled. It's got bike lanes, it's brand new, relatively new. It -- it can handle this traffic, but Rock Quarry Road cannot. And there will be serious safety implications if more vehicles, a lot more vehicles are put on there. And I -- and I think on a -- on a peak basis, the traffic study did not catch those numbers whatsoever. We are not anti-development. We -- we think there should be development in this area. This is not a neighborhood. Let's -- let's not kid ourselves, all this housing in this area that's going up is -- is -- is -- is -- is -- is student housing. There isn't any single family. We'd love to see that happen. We think there's a lot of development going on. I think a lot of these problems could be resolved if we could enhance the access to Grindstone and take it off of Rock Quarry. Once we put this traffic on Rock Quarry, whether it's single family or student or whatever, it's going to be a serious safety issue because Rock Quarry, as it sits today, is narrower than most city streets. And it's getting a tremendous amount of traffic and it's going to get a lot more, whether or not this development goes in. But 700 more parking places tells me it's going to be a lot more.

MR. STANTON: Thanks, sir.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you.

MR. BENBOYLE: Thank you, I appreciate it. Is it Mr. Patel, right?

You might have to pull that down a little bit.

MR. PATEL: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. PATEL: Hi, my name is Nirav Patel, 5732 Lindenwood Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri. So I can start off, I'm a licensed traffic engineer with the state of Missouri and I've been at CBB here for almost 10 years. And what I want to start off first is how we do this traffic study and how the process is. So mainly what

we do is we coordinate with city and MoDOT representatives. We ask them intersections they want us to look at, time periods they want us to look at, and so that we're addressing all of the things they want us to address in the traffic study. And then the process of the traffic study then is to understand or ascertain the existing conditions on the study roadways and the study intersections. So we do that by taking traffic counts.

So we collect the traffic counts here and February 2026 on a Thursday. So we typically do Wednesday -- Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursdays so that we're not -- we're looking at typical traffic patterns. On that day, we made sure that school academic calendars were still going as well as the weather that day was not difficult or discouraging people from being out on the roadways. What we do after that is we take that, we create traffic models of that, and we create existing conditions to figure out how the operations are at the study intersections. Then working with the developer, we figure out how many units they're going to have or beds they have, and we use IT data or international transportation engineers and publish a trip generation manual, and it's a standard resource in our industry. What this resource provides is based on the number of beds, how many vehicles will be generated by the development during your a.m., midday, or p.m. peaks. So that's what we'll use, and that has been industry standard. Based on that, we'll take that information, we'll look at the periods that we want to look at. Specifically for this study, we're asked by the city of MoDOT to look at midday and p.m. peak hour, and we'll figure out, based on existing travel patterns, where that traffic would go, and then ascertain the impact of those trips on the study intersections. We'll examine that in our models and then look at, is there any mitigation needed? And in this case, we found that no mitigation was needed at the study intersections to mitigate the impact of the increase in delay. We did recommend the stop sign at the plaza and Oak over there, Gray Oak, mainly to have some sort of traffic control there when, right now, it's free flow, but when you extend it, to have something there.

I did want to address some of the questions and things that have been said. Making a turn onto Rock Quarry Road, for that, what we found in our models that it operates level service D with an average delay of about 16 seconds. So you'll wait, on average, during the peaks, a vehicle would wait there 16 seconds to make a turn out. That's pretty good level service at an unsignalized intersection. And the other thing that, to address the safety questions that came up, we do recommend in our study that, at the intersections, that you provide adequate sight distance so that when you're in your vehicle, you can look left or right and make sure that the roadway is clear. To provide adequate sight distance, we recommend that the site engineer look at the sight triangles, as well as refrain from providing, you know, tall fences, tall vegetation right at the intersection, and to keep that farther away, as well as signs and things like that, to not have anything that blocks their view.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Patel, could we get to some of our questions, and that might --

MR. PATEL: Yeah. Go ahead, I'm sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think we've got a lot for you, specifically.

MR. PATEL: Sorry. Sorry, I just -- yeah, go ahead.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Gray, did you want to start?

DR. GRAY: Yes, thank you. Thank you for this elaboration and clarification.

I'm curious about, because we've had other traffic studies, and you're talking about the scope of it is developed alongside MoDOT and the city, and so, the decision to not look at AM levels, in your experience, in your expertise as an engineer, is there significant like variation in that, or is that -- does that make sense? Like, would we expect to see the a.m. as an outlier, given the consistency with the midday and p.m.?

MR. PATEL: So it depends on the use you're examining.

DR. GRAY: Mm-hmm.

MR. PATEL: So, with this specific, it's different as, per se, a commercial development. More often, it's in the p.m. and midday, for restaurants or gas stations. We found that fast foods, for example, is more in the a.m. than it is in p.m. For this use, with student housing specifically, the a.m. was not anticipated to have a significant amount of traffic that would be impacted on the roadways, is what our discussions with the city and -- and MoDOT was, and they recommended the -- not recommended, but recommended more to look at the midday and p.m. than the a.m. Just substantially, the a.m. peak is between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m., and in that time period, the significant amount of students that would leave would be most likely less than what it would be during the midday and the p.m.

DR. GRAY: Okay, interesting. Thank you. The -- and so, again, the scope of the study, it's done alongside MoDOT and the city, and so you're looking at roads that are directly impacted by like access, yes, so the stadium would not be considered.

MR. PATEL: No. So we generally look at near the vicinity of the site as well as the proposed intersections. Stadium being as far to the north as it is from here, that was not examined just due to the fact that it's just farther away from the site. If -- if that was requested, we would have, but that was also not requested to be examined either.

DR. GRAY: Okay. And I think my last question, your role in this is not to determine if there is

adequate infrastructure. It's to determine if there needs to be mitigation alongside the development.

MR. PATEL: Correct. Correct. We will look at what's out there today, and we'll look at the impact that the development has, and then determine if mitigation is needed based on impact. We do not make recommendations of what needs to be improved today out there, but just specifically what the development impacts, and then based on that impact, if improvements are needed.

MR. PATEL: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Okay. We'll go with Commissioner Darr and then Commissioner Brodsky.

MR. DARR: So have you driven Rock Quarry?

MR. PATEL: I have not, not recently, no. Not driving through yet.

Well, then my next question is going to be --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay, everybody --

MR. PATEL: I'll be honest.

MR. DARR: -- relevant. My questions were going to be the -- the traffic I'm following along well, and the results of the study, to me, speak for themselves, but we also have the point that was brought up to some of the -- by some of the other speakers that although this is considered a major collector from the city's point of view, because that's how it is on the map, and when you're considering if a development has adequate infrastructure access to major collector street, you know, it does on paper, but when you actually drive the street, you have, sorry, they're distracting.

MS. ORTIZ: Yes, very distracting.

MR. DARR: So when you drive the physical street itself, the cross section of the street, the width, I think it's 22, 24 feet. I mean, is that typical for a major collector in your experience?

MR. PATEL: I -- I would say it -- it depends on when the roadway was first developed. So if the roadway was there, and then over time, development has happened and it's utilized more, the roadway is what it is before. As -- if you're building a new roadway, and you want it to be as the characteristics of a major collector, then you build it to different standards, but if it's already there, then that's what the roadway is, not what the characteristics has changed over time. I would say that.

MR. DARR: Yeah. I mean, that's always a struggle. Like, you know, when do you approve it -- improve it before development or after the development. But, you know, the cross section, and then also the horizontal -- horizontal and vertical geometry of this road, you know, when I drive it, doesn't reflect a major collector to me. And with not necessarily just this development, any development in general and the existing base conditions is really taxing the capacity of this road to me, not by the number of trips a major collector can handle, like you're saying is added, and the intersection delays and stuff like that, but like the physical driving the road, but the horizontal -- horizontal and vertical geometry and the width of the street and the narrow lanes.

MR. PATEL: Mm-hmm. I understand. I would -- I would say at what we looked at, examined specifically, we did not examine the safety of Rock Quarry Road. We examined at the vicinity of what the proposed driveway would be as requested. And --

MR. DARR: Yeah. I understand it might have been outside your scope.

MR. PATEL: Yeah. Uh-huh.

MR. DARR: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: So looking at your traffic study, just need some help understanding.

MR. PATEL: Yeah.

MR. BRODSKY: So on -- I think I'm on the bottom of page 15, it's table one there. You have the number of beds, midday peak hour trips, p.m. peak hour trips. Now, the total for both of those is 230 and 225.

MR. PATEL: Yes.

MR. BRODSKY: That is trips for that hour?

MR. PATEL: Correct. That would be your total trips for that hour during --

MR. BRODSKY: Okay.

MR. PATEL: -- the peak. I would like to mention, so we looked at through IT and looked at 720 beds, but we also did counts at the nearby Central House Student Development, which is right on Rock Quarry, just to the southeast over there. And based on those counts, the total trips in and out during that same peak period, during the midday was 55 total trips and 64 in the PM. And their total number of beds is 634. So a little less than 90 than what this proposed development would be. So if we, using those trip rates of that existing local development that's already out there, this proposed development would be closer based on local data at 62 total trips and 73 during the midday and PM respectively, which would be 73 percent and 68 percent lower than what we found in IT. So the traffic analysis itself is a conservative analysis that most likely if this

development is, you know, similar draw, similar traffic utilization as other local development nearby, it would be a lot less lower of an impact overall.

MR. BRODSKY: I appreciate.

MR. PATEL: Sorry if I didn't answer.

MR. BRODSKY: No. No. No. No, you did very much.

MR. PATEL: I just wanted to mention that.

MR. BRODSKY: No. I appreciate that context very much.

Did you do -- did you come up with a number of, you know, total number of trips that would come out of this development in a -- in a 24-hour period?

MR. PATEL: We did not develop that, but that is something that IT can provide and we can look at that. But we mainly look at these peak periods specifically because if this is your most number of traffic vehicles on the roadway at a certain time, it is mainly -- if this is your worst impact during the day, it's safe to assume that outside of this time period, your impact would be less than that.

So that -- this is your worst case scenario.

MR. BRODSKY: Oh, that makes sense. I -- I went and looked on the MoDOT, you know, they have a pretty handy little traffic count maps. 4,000 trips on Rock Quarry southbound in any given day on average and 4,200 trips northbound on any given day on Rock Quarry. This is 2025. So what I'm hearing from you is that maybe we're probably looking at 100 trips in any given hour.

MR. PATEL: So generally speaking, we've found that your total trips in and out during the peaks represents about 10 percent of your traffic from throughout the day or more than that. So this is, you know, 200, if you multiply that by 10, that's probably where you're looking at and then divided per hour, less than 100.

MR. BRODSKY: Okay.

MR. PATEL: (Inaudible).

MR. BRODSKY: I'm just trying -- I'm trying to to get an idea of what's the total additional traffic load that's going to go on to Rock Quarry. As you've heard, Rock Quarry is -- is substandard as a collector street. In your opinion or experience as a traffic engineer, what would be the difference between these number of units as student housing compared to just a straight R1? What would be the difference in traffic volumes?

MR. PATEL: So with this, it's traffic volumes. What we've found is that student housing generally is just lower than regular apartments, partly because of when people are leaving and then.

MR. BRODSKY: Just regular housing --

MR. PATEL: Just housing, general.

MR. BRODSKY: Just like R1 housing, yeah.

MR. PATEL: So would R1 housing be more single family, detached kind of homes? It generally, we've found that it would be less than that. So mainly because R1, you have people that are driving every day in and out and more in the morning going to and from work and then coming back. With these types of student housing development, impacts more spread out through the day based on scheduling as well as the shuttle that we provided would be utilizing Providence, but that's also alternative use.

Due to the proximity it is from the school, the shuttle would most likely be more of a utilization than driving actually and walking.

MR. BRODSKY: Okay. Okay. And I did just want, I'm pretty sure I know the answer to this, but based on your estimates in your traffic study, midday peak hour traffic, you're estimating that 45 percent of the traffic coming out of this development is going to go north onto Rock Quarry Road and 35 percent in the p.m. peak hour?

MR. PATEL: Correct. Correct.

MR. BRODSKY: Mm-hmm. Thank you.

MR. PATEL: That's what we looked at, sorry.

MR. BRODSKY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I'm going to follow up on that. I'm looking on Google here. The ITE you refer to as Institute of Transportation Engineers --

MR. PATEL: Mm-hmm.

MR. WALTERS: and they estimate between 5.4 to 6.7 daily trips per dwelling unit. So if there's 720 dwelling units and there's six times that, that's 4,200 a day? Six times 720?

MR. PATEL: So it -- I guess are you looking at, so within that same, so I guess one question I have is, are you looking at land use to 25?

MR. WALTERS: I'm just looking here at a page, it's kind of giving an overview of traffic trip generation based on the type of units and they even go so far as talk about low-rise apartments, mid-rise

apartments and so forth. Anyway, their -- their overview, a total of 100-unit complex would generate 600 daily trips. So this is a 700 unit project, seven times that is 4,200, correct?

MR. PATEL: That is correct, but so for this study, we looked at low-rise off-campus student apartments, but we also did go in and specify, so ITE provides adjacent to campus and then over half a mile from campus.

So we looked at the half a mile and that average trip rate per bedroom for that, I just have the printout here, is 3.97. So then, looking at that at -- for the 720 beds, it'd be 2,800.

MR. WALTERS: What?

MR. PATEL: 2,800.

MR. WALTERS: Yeah.

MR. PATEL: A little on -- just a little over. So that's specifically what we looked at just because ITE also provides, it can separate out into different types of land uses for apartments and things like that. And we try to be as specific as possible so that we accurately reflect what the proposed development is looking to do.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Was it -- this may have been beyond what you -- you -- you were charged to do, but -- well, I'll save that for another question then.

Now -- now, here's the question. Gray -- Gray Oak would -- at some point I would expect Gray Oak will also be extended eastward to attach to Rock Quarry?

MR. KUNZ: It's likely that would occur, but it would require platting, which would first also require preliminary plat, and we do not know if there is any intention --

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MR. KUNZ: -- for development of the subsequent tracks that will be created from this track split.

MR. WALTERS: And in your studies, there was -- you concluded there was no need for an additional right turn lane into this development, correct?

MR. PATEL: Off of Rock Quarry Road, correct. We looked at MoDOT EBG, or their -- which is their standards, best practice standards and their guidelines, and we looked at that based on the speed of the roadway and the volume there today and the volume that we forecasted to use that driveway. It did not reach the thresholds to warrant a left turn or a right turn.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. That's all my questions for the speaker.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, any other questions? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: How much weight did the designation of Rock Quarry Road as a connector weigh in your study? Because as you can see where the question is going, our -- our major concern is the traffic increase on Rock Quarry Road. Have you personally driven that? Have you driven that road?

MR. PATEL: I answered that. No, I have not.

MR. STANTON: Okay. So if I was a traffic engineer and I was like, well, I'm trying to get a result. The result is I want to justify putting a driveway from Rock Quarry to this development, and I'm going to use the weight of this designated road because it's designated as a connector. It's been designated that way for over 100 years because before Columbia was Columbia, that was the commercial corridor from north and south. And it hasn't changed because it still does that. It's not in the capacity it did 100 years ago. So they can't really change it because that is an important north-south corridor.

So if you hear the -- hear where this is going, how much did that weigh in where you drive? Because your numbers to me aren't lining up. The road, really, if you haven't driven it, is really... And how does that fit into your equation, what it already is designated as?

MR. PATEL: So we look at what we look at when we look at where traffic is going. So the weight of what Rock Quarry Road is designated is not a factor in how -- how we look at how trips are coming in and out of the development and how they're used the roadway. What we do look at is how is the existing volume using that roadway and the nearby roadways? And based on that, we also look at the type of use that it is, and based on the users of that, what would be your convenient route in and out?

So specifically, we did weight the connections that Rock Quarry Road provides to the north fairly heavily by looking at in the midday and p.m. peaks, by putting almost most of the traffic during those times at 45 percent in the midday and 35 percent in the p.m. on to and from the north on Rock Quarry. So we did look at -- we did not go into this trying to avoid having traffic on that roadway. We examined most of our traffic during the period to and from the development on the roadway because we did find that as a convenient route for the students that would be living in this area.

So does that answer your question of what weight we put on the roadway or how we examined it?

MR. STANTON: It was a good answer from an engineer. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Does the, Mr. Patel -- sorry, does the ITE take into

account the scenic roadway status --

MR. PATEL: It --

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- at all?

MR. PATEL: It takes into account the location of the development or types of these types of developments generically and looks at the number of trips (inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: So that designation doesn't hold any weight?

MR. PATEL: No. It does -- it's -- it's data from all across the country.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. PATEL: It doesn't look at adjacent roadway types or uses or volume. It looks mainly at how much is, how many beds the site provides and then -- and that's -- and how many trips are coming in and out.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And you didn't measure any a.m. trips because the parameters guided you towards the midday and p.m.?

MR. PATEL: Yeah. Based on the type of uses and the students and there was an understanding based with the discussion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Your methodological assumptions, yeah.

MR. PATEL: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. PATEL: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Any other questions?

MR. ZENNER: If I may --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, did you have something?

MR. ZENNER: If I may, on behalf of the staff, just while we have our traffic engineer present and based upon what I believe to be some of the significantly expressed concerns is we have northbound traffic movements on Rock Quarry, either be it in the midday or p.m. peak. I'd like to ask the question and I'd like our, I'd like -- I'd like the traffic engineer to respond to this for the commission's benefit. If the intersection that is proposed to be installed, which is a regulatory requirement to ensure that we have fire access, it is a regulatory, it will be a regulatory or a roadway network benefit given that Gray Oak Drive, which may or may not be extended along the southern portion of the track to the south, which is anticipated and planned on all of our mapping to go to the intersection just north of Rock Quarry and Rhinestone. If this -- if -- if this roadway, if Retreat Way is put in, it will potentially avoid the necessity for that and it will avoid creating a new intersection even closer to an intersection that may already be challenged.

My question really is, is if the restriction, if there is restriction placed at this future intersection of Retreat Way such that right, left turning movements outbound are restricted, meaning a right in, right out only is assigned to this particular intersection, what benefit, the benefit at least from a staff perspective is that forces all the traffic back down to Grindstone and it forces it back out on Green Meadows, two major roadways that do not further impact potentially Rock Quarry except in a return trip movement.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, did you have a question for him?

MR. ZENNER: I do have a question.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: And I'm going to ask the question is, what value would that provide as it relates to potential traffic impacts heading northbound? Will that solve some of the concerns that you have heard here this evening?

MR. PATEL: Yes. So what, by providing access there, you have another alternative route out and as we've shown in the study, that operates fairly well right now or is forecasted to.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think Mr. Zenner is saying, would a right in, right out only intersection there alleviate any of the northbound traffic concerns? Would it reduce the number of trips going northbound?

MR. PATEL: Oh, sorry -- I'm sorry for the misunderstanding, it would not. So the -- even if you do right in, right out at that driveway, the vehicles will find, will have an alternate route to get there. So you're increasing volume on Grindstone Parkway, at Grindstone Plaza intersection and the Rock Quarry Road signal at those two locations.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PATEL: I'm sorry for the confusion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It's okay.

Any other questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much, Mr. Patel. And thank you very much for giving us very scientific and clear answers. I appreciate that. It -- can't tell you how much we get policy speak sometimes. So I appreciate that.

MR. PATEL: I understand. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next? Name and address for the record, please?

MR. SCHENKER: (Inaudible), Cliff Drive, Sixth Ward.

After hearing all the testimony, I would -- I would like to get 30 seconds. I would like the commission to reject this. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Schenker. Any questions for Mr. Schenker? No?

Next member to speak, please come forward. Are you coming forward, ma'am? Name and address?

MS. BREKHUS: Rachel Brekhus, 703 Hilltop Drive. I'm actually here for something else, but having heard all of this, I am looking at that map there and wondering why is it that the egress -- that the one exit had to be onto Rock Quarry? What would have prevented it from going to that other north-south over there to the west? And -- and keeping the one to the -- the south. And, you know, and -- and a comment with respect to travel and trips toward the university. I know somebody who just moved to town and does live down by Veterans United, and her Google Maps is always routing her to go up Rock Quarry Road. She refuses. She is terrified of it and -- and takes Providence instead. So -- and the idea that widening it or -- or broadening it would -- would solve the problem. No, it will just bring traffic that isn't going there now to it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, ma'am. And the answer is the fire code.

Mr. Colbert?

MR. COLBERT: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the commission. Caleb Colbert, attorney at 1203 West Broadway. Here tonight on behalf of the applicant. Given some of the questions about the traffic study and the connection to Rock Quarry, the applicant would like to table this request to provide the commission with an updated traffic study with a supplement that addresses some of the concerns that have been raised this evening and look at the possibility of restricting access to -- to Rock Quarry Road, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Colbert.

MR. COLBERT: You're very welcome.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions about Mr. Colbert's request? Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: I would just -- it may be -- I'll just say it in my comments afterwards.

MR. COLBERT: Okay.

MR. DARR: It's not for you in particular.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

Any other member of the public to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. LOWE: Hello, my name is Shane Lowe, 1660 High Ridge Circle over in the Fourth Ward. Gray Oak Drive is one of the main routes that I commute via e-bike to work in the morning. And it's got a nice bike ped path on the north side of it. I do notice that at Grindstone Plaza, we don't really have any sort of crossing there for pedestrians, and it makes it kind of awkward to navigate, the only other entrance onto Gray Oak is like 600 more feet to the west. And so, what you kind of have to do is you have to come down that bike ped path and then cut across traffic, or you kind of ignore it because you don't have good access across.

So if this does go, and I would like to see some more improvements on that Grindstone Plaza, Gray Oak. Gray Oak is also a very wide-open street. Right now, it doesn't get a lot of traffic, so it's not too much of an issue. But I'm a bit concerned that you start throwing a bunch of cars on that, and they're going to start ripping down that thing, because it's a pretty wide street for what it is.

One of the things, though, that I do want to call attention to is I think this is like, how do we develop this area? This is way too valuable a property to zone for R1. This is right next to a commercial area. It's something to where, you know, if I was a student hot dog, I have the chance to walk and get my groceries. I have the chance to walk to so many places to eat and so forth. I love this. The issue is, I think we're assuming that every student's going to take their car and go right north on Rock Quarry. And so I think part of the question is, as we zone this, is there a way we can zone this that we disincentivize students to have a car and to take it straight north? The dorms are student housing in suite style. I can tell you that very few of the students there, you know, take a trip on a regular basis. And the reason for that is their parking is a whole way away, and it's a hassle to get to their car. And so, given some of the flexibility we have with a PD, I think that's an option that we can get higher density on this plat, and we can also distance, you know, we can bake in there like, no, we don't need to have a parking space for every single student here because we can't afford as a city for every single student to take their car.

And if that's a deal breaker, that's a deal breaker for the development. But, you know, there's plenty of these developments that have shuttles to it. We've got to build up the density if we ever want to be able to put in public transit through this kind of corridor, which is one of the few ways that I think you can really make Rock Quarry safe, while also maintaining its scenic and historic character.

And that's about all that I have for now. I would really just encourage, like, we have to consider how do we develop this in a dense fashion that provides the value to the city that this land really has, and how

do we do so in a way that, you know, doesn't default to everyone who lives here just to take a car and go north.
MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, any questions for the speaker? Seeing none, thank you for being here.

Anyone else to speak on this case? Seeing none, the applicant has made a request for a tabling. Generally, we honor such requests by voting on a tabling. Council, is that --

MR. DARR: Yes. I just maybe want to consult with the applicant about a date certain.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Colbert, would you please re-approach and give us a date certain?

MR. COLBERT: Absolutely. We were looking at June 4th, if that's enough time to get a supplement in to the city and have --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is that the meeting that's canceled? No.

MR. DARR: We're going to let it be our last available meeting until June -- until July 23rd. June 4th would be more appropriate given the volume of cases at this point. I can't speak to our staff's capacity to be able to do a full review of a revised traffic study. However, we will see what we can end up doing. That would be the probable date certain.

MS. GEUEA JONES: June 4th --

MR. COLBERT: June 4th.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- then?

MR. COLBERT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I know our June 11th meeting is very full.

MR. COLBERT: Fourth would be perfect.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Date certain, June 4th.

MR. COLBERT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. All right.

Without seeing other movement for public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comment. Any commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Darr and Commissioner Ortiz.

MR. DARR: I just -- the volume really, in and of itself, doesn't bother me. It's the -- it's the nature and the characteristic of Rock Quarry Road that just gives me a little bit of pause. And it just, to me, it boils down, like as a community, do we want this to be a functional collector and have development on the road? Or do we want to preserve the scenic nature and the characteristic of the road it is now and limit development and limit traffic on the road? And I don't know -- I mean, that's kind of a decision for council. Maybe each of us have our own individual opinion on that. I would like to see development there. I hate to -- hate to lose Rock Quarry Road as a scenic road, but as I've -- I think about more, I lean towards it's probably just time to improve the road, spend the money, is kind of where I'm at.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I was really disappointed by some of the rhetoric tonight, especially around student housing and apartments and the -- the -- the thought that R1 would be more appropriate in this area. I agree with Shane that it would not be an appropriate use.

I also want to thank Mr. Patel for being a trooper up here with the questioning. I have opinions on this case generally, but my opinions are around the inadequate infrastructure, not about the traffic study itself. So I just thank you for coming up here and being -- being -- answering our questions. Also, I've never driven down Rock Quarry proudly because I don't drive a car, and there are lots of people in our community that cannot drive for various reasons. So when everyone's laughing, let's think about like, there are people that come down from St. Louis that are consultants and that contribute to our city, and there's people in our community that don't drive. Those are real people. Yeah, I think that's all my comments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: On the side with my fellow Commissioner, Mr. Darr, I think we can do both. I think it's -- we have to deal with the reality of the road. It's a collective historically. And that's the reason why I asked if you drove it, because we can still preserve it, but we have to preserve it in a smart way, which means we have to develop in that area smartly. And we've already, I've had a lot of dealings with the Rock Quarry Road Preservation Group, and I learned a lot from them. So improving it doesn't seem like it's on the radar immediately. How many people got to die before it gets on the list? It's -- it's a driver's road, you know -- to be honest. You really got to know what you're doing driving on that road, and we need to develop in that area smartly. I like -- I like the -- I like the plan, I do. I just am not comfortable with the traffic off Rock Quarry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Other Commissioner comments? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I'll just echo a lot of what Commissioner Darr said. I think you hit the nail on the head. You know, are we going to improve this road and make full use of the land along Rock Quarry, or are

we not going to improve this road and limit the development potential of the land along it? I -- so that's -- that's where I'm at. You know, there's 4,000 trips southbound, 4,200 northbound, and, you know, I know we're estimating traffic numbers here, but we're looking at 2,800 trips out of this development in any given day. 45 percent of them are going north in the midday, and 35 percent of them are going north in the p.m. So we're -- we're talking about increasing the load on -- on Rock Quarry going north by a considerable amount. So that -- that has me concerned. I'm not sure I'm in favor of tabling it either, because right in, right out, they're just going to go down Gray Oak, and they're going to go down Grindstone, and they're going to get on Rock Quarry anyway. So I -- I -- I don't know that a new traffic study is going to persuade me one way or the other.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other commissioner comments? Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: I am curious, if this came before us in another kind of zoning, so if it came as RMF, would we have had the traffic study at all?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes, we would have. I'm seeing nods from staff.

DR. GRAY: Okay. Yeah, this has been interesting. I really tried to separate the traffic congestion issue from adequate infrastructure. Really thank you for the additional information from the traffic engineer, because I think some of those get conflated alongside public safety, and I want to make sure that the criteria by which we're making those decisions is clear. I think that additional information would be useful, given that they submitted it as a PD plan to have more input from the -- the neighbors. Like that was the point. So if the neighbors are saying this, then I think we can allow them to follow through on that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other? Commissioners Stockton?

MS. STOCKTON: We'll dial in here, well, since we're going late. I appreciate the traffic study. I -- I do agree with the community that I don't think the numbers show everything. Like it's too high level. It's -- it's a road that you would find in Arkansas in the middle of a town with high traffic. The guardrails are a good idea. I know when I went to college here in the late 90s, early 2000s, I avoided that road. I mean, it was like drunk driver, like after a certain time of night, you just didn't go on it, because it seemed like every other weekend, somebody was in a drunk driving accident, sometimes fatal, sometimes not. When I moved back to town, you know, five years ago, I was happy to see, and you know, 15 years ago, a lot more development downtown. I was like, good, you know, at least they won't be driving that road. Like truthfully, it was something that even in my young 20s, I thought about all the time. I did have fun. Yeah, it wasn't like, but I didn't go on that road on purpose. And I don't know if it's radical to ask like the developer to pay a fee, or like, I understand \$13 million is a lot of money. And I don't know if we can -- I don't know how this works. And that's for the city to decide, but the development needs to happen one way or another. I know people that live down there, you know, in Central House, the buses are there. I have my opinions on the buses. They suddenly -- I don't know if you remember, but this winter, like the kids just got up and walked out of my class like 20 minutes in, because they're like, the buses are closing because the roads are too bad. And I guarantee it was that road.

So the buses aren't necessarily able to handle it. I like your idea of more multimodal, but the truth is there's apartment units downtown that don't offer parking. And guess what? They all show up at Mizzou Parking and Development. They like leave a like ration, because they know that will happen every year, because the kids come from wherever. And they're just like, I have no place literally to park my car in town. So stifling it doesn't necessarily cause -- like -- like create the solution. I agree, we should create more options, but constricting doesn't necessarily solve it. So I think it's a combination of figuring out how we can afford to fix the road. And I agree with that.

I mean, I think we as a town are moving towards that. Development, needing the housing, whether we like it or not, we're a university town. That's the main economy. And I think we need to support that. Students, residential, R1, all of it. And yeah, I guess those are my only thoughts.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Other comments?

MS. ORTIZ: Can I come back? Sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry. Go ahead, Commissioner Ortiz.

MS. ORTIZ: I definitely support tabling this, because I think even hearing other Commissioner comments, we're equating inadequate infrastructure with the traffic study. Like we're doing it in our comments. And I think they're two separate things. And I think that with more details from a traffic study, we would be able to make a better informed decision.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Any other Commissioner comments? Seeing none. Would someone like to make the tabling motion? Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: Yeah, I'll make a motion. Regarding case number 124-2026, the retreat at Columbia rezoning PD plan and preliminary plat, I make a motion to table the case to the June 4th planning and zoning meeting.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion was made by Commissioner Darr and seconded by

Commissioner Gray to table the case to date certain June 4. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That case will be tabled to date certain June 4. Given that, is there going to be re-advertisement?

MR. KUNZ: Yes. There will be required re-advertisement in the Columbia Tribune. I can also ensure to send out notification letters just like we did last time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, Mr. Kunz.

MR. KUNZ: You're welcome.