

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
July 10, 2025

Case Number 229-2025

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Socket Land Company LLC (owner), for approval of a ten-lot preliminary plat of R-MF (Multiple-family Dwelling) zoned property, to be known as White Gate South Plat 2. The subject site contains 27.45 acres, including the property located at 2703 Clark Lane.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed ten-lot preliminary plat known as "White Gate South Plat 2".

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had any contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any members of the public are here to speak on this case, please come forward. We allow six minutes for the applicant and groups, three minutes for all individuals. I will be timing you.

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. Jay Gebhardt, civil engineer with A Civil Group, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. I -- you guys have got a long meeting tonight, and it seems like this is pretty straightforward, so I'm here to answer questions, if you all have any.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Gebhardt. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: Mr. Gebhardt.

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes.

MR. DARR: I don't see any additional right-of-way for anything for I-70 or Clark Lane there. I assume there's no impacts for the I-70 improvements that would impact this property?

MR. GEBHARDT: It's a good question. So MoDOT does not need any additional right-of-way for this future round-about exit/entrance to I-70 that they propose there, and they refused our request to connect to that round-about. So that's why, like, Ridgeway takes that dog leg to the west and comes out on Clark Lane west of the future round-about.

MR. DARR: Thank you.

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

much.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other members of the public to speak on this case, please come forward, and state your name and address for the record.

MR. MORRISON: Thank you. My name is Paul Morrison, 2714 Squire Circle. Lake Ridgeway will go right behind my house. So I'm not really thrilled with this project, but I understand that it needs to go through. And one thing I have a concern with is the connection of Lambeth to Lake Ridge Way. We've lived at this location for 25 years and we used to have a lot of property damage in our area, and then when they closed off Lambeth, when they stopped allowing go-throughs at Lambeth, that all stopped. And so I would be concerned with increased property damage if we went to make Lambeth connect with the Lake Shore Drive or whatever that is. It makes a -- it's just a straight route from our neighborhood onto the highway, and right now there's no real clean getaway from any crimes that are happening in our neighborhood. So, basically, if anything happens in our neighborhood, they have to go to Whitegate and Sylvan where they're easily caught. And so that's my concern. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Oh, wait, one moment, please. Any questions?
Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Can you share what the property damage has been in the past?

MR. MORRISON: Stolen things from our -- my driveway, vandalism, painted -- you know, paint dumped on our cars. I think there was a break-in, as well. We just really haven't had anything. It's been -- we've had a great run here lately, you know, and I'm sure that has a lot to do with our police department, but still that closing off. And also Lambeth has -- recently, we've got a lot of group homes that have gone in that area. Right? And so what's that -- what that has resulted in is a lot of cars on the street. There's a lot more residents in our neighborhood, and so they all have cars and they're all parked along the sides of the streets. And I worry that if we run -- if it is a, you know, viable for somebody to go from Whitegate to I-70 that way instead of going down Clark Lane, they're going to do that. And that's my concern, so thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Any other member of the public to speak on this case, please come forward. Again, name and address for the record. And, ma'am, you may need to pull that down. Those last two guys were quite tall. Thank you.

MS. MORRISON: Thank you. My name is Robin Morrison; my husband and I have lived at 2714 Whitegate -- or, sorry -- excuse me -- 2714 Square Circle for 25 years. Like my husband indicated, it's been a relatively quiet neighborhood over the years. A number of homes down Lambeth have in recent years been turned into duplexes and multi-family dwellings. That has increased the number of cars and people in the area. It's already a rather heavily population dense area anyway. I'm concerned about adding more people and more traffic to that area. I, too, share great concerns about connecting that and making that more of a throughway so that people can get through there. We have a lot of children in the

area that do play in the street, and we like that because the streets are closed off, so we don't have a lot of fast traffic that comes through there and the kids can play in the street. I'm afraid that it will impact that. I also have concerns about taking away that green area and impacting the Hinkson Creek area. It is kind of a buffer zone for us between us and the highway. It mutes the noise for us personally, and I'm just really concerned about the increased population and traffic and impact on Hinkson Creek.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Do you have any potential solutions to the concerns you have?

MS. MORRISON: Not connecting Lambeth to Ridgeway. I understand -- when we bought our house in 2000, the ten-year plan at that time was to connect from Bass Pro down to Clark Lane, and that has not materialized yet. I expected it to at some point, but I'm very much against connecting Lambeth to that because that's going to increase a lot of traffic through the neighborhood. And like my husband indicated, we already have a lot more cars on the street, a lot more traffic already, and I really don't want to increase that.

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

MR. WALTERS: I was wondering if maybe staff could clarify or explain that -- why they are or what applicants in the City have come to conclude that Lambeth should connect, and I would expect it because if Lambeth was a cul-de-sac, it would exceed a lot of standards for maximum cul-de-sac length. Can someone elaborate a little bit?

MR. PALMER: I did not measure that, but that could be part of the -- the consideration, but just generally, our policy is to connect where connections are available so that we complete the roadway network and we provide alternative routes both in terms of traffic volume and then also in terms of emergency response, so --

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MORRISON: That road was originally connected while it was privately maintained, was my understanding when we lived there in 2000. I believe that former Mayor Rodney Smith, as well as the Lambeth family at the end in conjunctions with the owners of the Socket property at the time would pay and split the cost to maintain that roadway, and at some point, that did get shut down and not viable as a route through anymore and it has greatly improved the quality of our neighborhood since that happened.

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

MS. MORRISON: Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other speakers on this case, please come forward. And again, name and address for the record.

MR. ANDERSON: Gus Anderson, 1412 Lambeth Drive. As you head north on Lambeth past Squire, and the road changes and becomes Whitegate, it makes a wide swooping left turn. The street on Lambeth is wide, the street on Whitegate is wide, but as you make that turn, the road shrinks and gets narrow. And the families in that curve on the inside and the outside have multiple cars that are parked in

that curve. It is basically one lane, and you're kind of going slightly up a little bit of a slope as you're turning, and it's a blind corner. You may as well close your eyes as you make that turn because you cannot see what's coming from the west on Whitegate toward that curve. Now, separate from that, I have a question. Multi-family dwellings, are we talking duplexes, ten of them, quad-plexes, rows of townhouses, five-story tall apartment buildings with 20 units in each one, what are we talking about?

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

MR. STANTON: -- well, that cannot be answered at this time, that's not -- or what we have in front of us right now.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Correct.

MR. STANTON: I'm just trying to give the speaker closure. (Inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Yeah. So multi-family dwellings could be any of those things within bounds. I don't think five stories would fit. I think 35 feet is the height restriction, so you're talking three stories-ish, maybe four you could get in. But we don't know because we don't approve specific plans. What we approve is land use and we have an entire multi-volume code that tells them what they can and can't build based on that zoning, and how they have to screen for it against other residential and all of that sort of thing. But I am sure that somebody from the Neighborhood Department would be happy if you wanted to call any time during regular business hours to walk through what could be built in R-MF, but anything that would be allowed in R-MF would be allowed here. So we don't know for sure exactly what they're planning to build. But currently, they could build on some portion of it, the question is -- or I guess -- (inaudible) -- but yeah. I hope that answers your question a little bit. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: So that tall gentleman with the A on his hat, he's the engineer. Right? He may have the answers to your questions.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Gebhardt.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: Talk to that big guy back there.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any other members of the public to speak on this case tonight? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments? Question for staff. This is already partially zoned. We are doing a platting action, so -- so what is currently able to be built?

MR. PALMER: Well, that's hard to answer. Just generally, I could tell you R-MF is a maximum of 20 -- well, it's -- it's a minimum of 2,500 square feet of lot area per unit. That probably doesn't mean much right now, because we don't know how big that R-MF is. But the fact is that every -- everything could be built with multi-family because MC would allow multi-family, as well. So that's not really a direct answer, but, I mean, that can get us to an answer if we kind of do some math, you know.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Let me ask you a better question. There is nothing preventing them from building on this property currently with the zoning? We are simply re-dividing it in a way that they want to build whatever project they have in mind.

MR. PALMER: Right. Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: All right. So they -- they could build on this today, even if we all vote no?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. I think the big limiting factor is access, so one thing we have to do is plat the road --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. PALMER: -- so that they gain the access, and then that would activate a lot of this area that's really not accessible without the street.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So the consequences of the no vote is that they sharpen their pencils and come up with a different way to use the property, but they can still use the property. There is nothing from preventing them from using it?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. I mean, the prelim plat doesn't -- doesn't dictate what's being built, it just dictates where the lot lines are allowed to go, and the -- the entitlement to those lots. The fact is they could request a rezoning in the future, and that's -- that's neither here nor there. That's not part of this request and we don't have any indication that's their intention, but, you know, it could go either way, and they may seek M-C zoning on the whole thing or, you know, they could seek to downzone it. I don't -- you know, there's not a lot of benefit to that to the landowner, but that's a possibility.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other Commissioner comments? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I'd be very curious to hear more from staff about this potential concept of not connecting Lambeth. In general, you know, we are supportive of connectivity and, you know, I'm personally generally supportive of that. But this might be a case that we might want to think about that a little bit more, just looking at the lay of the land and how these roads exist now with the residential, and the potential to be strongly impacted by the -- the new roundabout and I-70 connection that's going in on Clark.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. So just generally speaking, the Code, again, it requires that we make connections where they're available. This does stub to the property where you see this -- this extension. As we say, before it actually did extend previously, it was -- it was privately owned and maintained at that time, so it never was up to any kind of City standard. But, yeah, just if we were asked to support it, as a staff, we wouldn't be able to do that. But that is not our decision to make, it's our recommendation, like you guys recommend to Council. Yeah, it is something that could be included in your motion, and could be forwarded to Council for consideration. So it's up to you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner -- oh, I'm sorry. Commissioner Stockton and then Stanton. Do you have -- oh. Commissioner Gray, please?

DR. GRAY: Apologies for continuing the staff question in Commissioner comment. I noted on

the preliminary plat that you have the floodplain and stream buffer. Is there anything in this decision that would change or affect that?

MR. PALMER: Can you repeat that? I'm sorry.

DR. GRAY: Okay. On the plat, it lists the floodplain and stream buffer, and I know that the Code has particular things around that and that you noted those things in your report. Is there anything that we're doing in this decision that would affect or the -- the Hinkson Creek?

MR. PALMER: So the items you talk about are actually shown here in the extreme southeast corner.

DR. GRAY: Uh-huh.

MR. PALMER: The floodplain being this line here and then the floodway, which is not labeled, I don't think, but I'm assuming is this dash line. So -- I'm sorry. I have those backwards. The flood -- the floodplain line, you can actually build in that, but it only touches this -- this far corner, and floodway would be restricted. Beyond that our storm-water requirements, wouldn't allow any significant discharge, you know, like they wouldn't be able to increase discharge off the site into the -- into the creek. So while it -- you know, it would be part of the building plan or the site plan process that would be evaluated by our engineers to make sure that it's not having detrimental impacts, so --

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. PALMER: Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: So kind of hearing the last question that Commissioner Darr had to Mr. Gebhardt concerning accesses granted from either MoDOT or the City, I think that probably influenced greatly how the design of this road was produced. And it's policy to connect where -- where roads can be connected. The only reason it's not connected now is because the private people that were doing it before abandoned that obligation. If they were still doing it, it would be connected right now. I understand the concerns. Is it enough to throw this whole thing in the trash? I don't think so. I would have to hear a bigger case.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you. Do you -- I guess this is a question for staff. Is there anything that would prevent or preclude Lambeth from receiving traffic calming devices in the future?

MR. ZENNER: Traffic calming processes, a rated procedure, they would have to request traffic calming. It would have to be rated, and then, at some point, if it rates high enough, traffic calming can be placed on Lambeth. I think as Mr. Palmer was trying to point out, connectivity of Lambeth to the extension of Ridgeway is essential. It is -- it is required by our Code. The only way that it would be able to be eliminated would be through a design adjustment because it is a regulatory requirement. We require stubs of streets to be carried through. So again, while the Commission may desire that it not be done, it -- what the applicant is proposing here is a fully compliant subdivision to our subdivision regulations. And so the applicant would have to, at that point, if you denied the plat or you make a

recommendation, I would imagine it would be remanded back to you because the action has not followed the appropriate procedure, to seek relief. And so what the applicant has presented here is a fully compliant subdivision plan.

MS. ORTIZ: I just want to clarify that my -- that I don't think that we should not connect it. My suggestion was more to provide those in the neighborhood with the option of seeking out future traffic calming devices if that's what -- if this does go through, and that that is an option, and I wanted to ensure that there was nothing that would make it impossible for them to request that in the future.

MR. ZENNER: Traffic calming devices would go through our Public Works department to be placed on the list for rating. And as they get rated, and then they are available to be funded, that then would allow for it. So no. The homeowners along Lambeth have every right to continue to pursue that if this project were to be approved, but it is not through the Planning Department, it is through our Public Works staff.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other Commissioner comment? Seeing none. Would anyone like to make a motion on this case? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, if staff could help in -- in expediting this process, thank you. As it relates to Case 229-2025, Whitegate South Preliminary Plat, I move to approve the Whitegate South Plat 2 Preliminary Plat.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Stanton; seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. 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: Mr. Darr, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Stockton, Dr. Gray. The Motion carries 9-0.

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. For our next case -- we now go into public hearings.