

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
June 9, 2022

Case Number 109-2022

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Lyon Crest Properties, LLC (owners), seeking approval of a major amendment to the "Cotswold Villas at Bluff Creek Estates PUD Plan" and a design adjustment to Section 29-5.1 of the UDC relating to development access. The proposed revision will re-name the existing PD Plan to "PD Planned Development of Bluff Creek Estates, Plat No. 8" and includes proposed revisions that modify the lot arrangement and internal roadway network, and a revised statement of intent (SOI). The revised PD plan contains a total of 36 single-family lots and is consistent with the prior plan approval. (This request was tabled at the April 7, 2022, Planning Commission meeting.)

MS. LOE: May we have a staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends:

1. Approve the requested design adjustment for more than 30 lots accessed from a single point of ingress/egress; and
2. Approve the "Bluff Creek Estates, Plat No. 8 PD Plan," and the associated revised Statement of Intent.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Palmer. Before we move on to questions for staff, I would like to ask any Commissioners who have had any ex parte related to this case to please share that with the Commission now so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on the case in front of us. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. Mr. Palmer, I have one question about the sprinkler system. That's a new thing. So having been on this Commission for almost ten years, this is the first that I'm hearing about this. This is -- can you explain just a little bit more about the -- the discussion and decision about that?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. As I said, the fire code is a bit of a new version. I believe this was an addition in that. And basically, it goes along with the access -- the emergency access issue. And so now, basically, the fire code reads that if over 30 lots are accessed from a single point, all of the homes within - within that have to be sprinkled. It's just a second layer of -- of protection for them. And in this case, like I said, they are well over the 30, and kind of as a mitigation, the applicant offered to sprinkle the homes, which, you know, really would have been required, but then the Code actually goes further to say that all of the homes have to be sprinkled. And so, you know, retroactively, fitting all of those homes is not really

an option, so hence the BCCC granted that waiver.

MS. BURNS: Thank you for the additional information.

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Obviously, interim Chief White spent a lot of time with this. Are these turnarounds big enough for their new trucks? Is that -- will there be a problem with that?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Being looped streets, they're actually much larger than the standard.

MR. MACMANN: My concern was not just -- I mean, I noticed the spacing was good, but where our secondary parking is on-the-street parking.

MR. PALMER: Right.

MR. MACMANN: So that -- that was my concern. I was wondering if, you know, Chief White put that in his -- in his calculus or not.

MR. PALMER: I don't know that Chief White did, but their -- their review staff definitely did. They had intimate knowledge of what was going on here and --

MR. MACMANN: But they didn't raise any flags. That was my concern. I mean --

MR. PALMER: There was -- there were some discussions early on about how to address those types of issues, and -- and this design is the result of that conversation.

MR. MACMANN: I will ask you a bit of a radical question. And this is for future reference because we -- this might come up again; i.e. Commissioner Burns' comment. Couldn't giving a new PD on this, a new plat, have resolved the issue, rather than giving an exception? You know, so we have some not sprinkled, some sprinkled?

MR. ZENNER: No. So as Mr. Palmer has described this, the fire code is broken into two different parts. The issue at hand specific to this development is that it has over 30 lots or units being served off of a single point of access. In 2017, and if I am not incorrect, in 2018, when we adopted the fire code, the fire code and UDC were aligned to be that no residential development or no development could have over 30 lots off of a single point. The Code is always read that the fire official has the authority to grant exception to that rule. And so the application of utilizing residential fire sprinkling systems, while new to this Commission, is not a tool that has not previously existed under either set of regulations over 100 or now over 30. So the applicant, understanding that they wanted a development initially of 39 units, knew that they were going to have to seek some type of relief from the fire service, volunteered to provide the residential fire sprinklers to address the issue of their development specifically as shown before you. However, the fire code further reads as it was analyzed by the fire marshal's office, that the development as a whole also counts towards a maximum of 30 lots or units accessed off of a single point of access, and the way that the fire code was interpreted by the fire officials was all remaining built structures within Bluff Creek would also need to be sprinkled, an expectation beyond the reach of this applicant and generally beyond the reach reasonably for the City to ask 100-plus homes to retrofit them to sprinkle.

Therefore, they went to the Board of Construction and Code Appeals and sought their variance that they received from them to waive the entire development requirement, as well as to substitute a secondary point of access in lieu of the fire sprinkling in this specific development, which was granted. So the fire service is supportive of this project based on the unique condition that these 36 units will be sprinkled and based on the fact that the Board of Construction Code Appeals approved the overriding Bluff Creek variance for all homes to be sprinkled.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for staff? If not, I have a couple of questions, Mr. Palmer. One, just for my information, but how would the cul-de-sac to the north on Pebble Creek Place be measured. Do you take that from Pebble Creek Way, or do you take it from Dursley Loop?

MR. PALMER: In terms of fire access, you mean?

MS. LOE: In terms of our subdivision limits.

MR. PALMER: I believe it would be from the nearest cross street, which would be the Dursley Loop, I believe.

MR. ZENNER: Or right where the cursor is right now on the screen.

MR. PALMER: And that would provide, basically, a T-turnaround.

MS. LOE: I can't see that.

MR. PALMER: Sorry.

MS. LOE: We're having that cursor problem again.

MR. PALMER: The center -- the center loop to the north. That would be the center loop there.

MS. LOE: There we go. All right. All right. And then another question. We just went through a street renaming exercise, and I was curious. We, on this proposed plat, there's a Dursley Creek Place and then a -- or I'm sorry -- a Pebble Creek Place and a Pebble Creek Way. I thought we just were told that we couldn't have two streets with similar --

MR. PALMER: So there's a standard that's -- the suffix changes based on the -- the design of the street. So you can have, you know, a Walnut Street and a Walnut Court, and a Walnut Court would be a cul-de-sac, typically, as an example, and I believe that's what's at play here is you have an extension of Pebble Creek Court becomes -- yeah.

MS. LOE: I understand that. But I thought we tried to avoid having names of streets with the same name at the front so that there would be less confusion -- I understand there's probably no addresses off of Pebble Creek Way, but if you could just refresh my memory on what we try to avoid with names.

MR. ZENNER: Joint Communications reviewed the street names, so let me just -- I'll leave it at that, and they didn't complain.

MS. LOE: All right.

MR. ZENNER: So the applicant didn't propose any additional street names. And that's -- we rely on them in order to provide us the commentary as to it. And in this instance, I think it's as consistent as

inconsistent can be.

MS. LOE: All right. I'm going to hold you to that, Mr. Zenner. Okay. Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open up the floor to public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. LOE: If anyone has any comments they would like to make, please give your name and address for the record. We do give you three minutes to speak. If you're speaking for a group, we allow you six minutes.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you. Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineer, 1000 West Nifong. With me tonight is Shelley Ravapudi, who is the -- the applicant and developer for this piece of this property. She is a resident of the Bluff Creek neighborhood adjacent to this piece of property, close by to this piece of property, so she knows it fairly well. I believe that Mr. Palmer did a very thorough staff report, but we'll -- a quick little overview. Again, we're looking at 6.7 acres of a piece of property that's already been platted. It's currently zoned PD. We're obviously asking for a modification to the existing Statement of Intent, as well as a new PD plan for that property. Again, you've seen the plan itself. This is the previous plan. You can kind of see in our eyes that the proposed plan is -- is superior in several different -- several different ways. The intent for this piece of property is to do smaller lots, smaller homes, but we don't want to change really the character of the neighborhood. We still want nice homes. We still want some character with the homes themselves. And so these are some renderings that my client has had done for this specific development. So these are homes that she is looking at constructing within the development itself. And so you can kind of see that the architectural feel is still there, so that's what she's looking for. Just because they're smaller lots on -- smaller homes doesn't mean that they're going to take away from the existing neighborhood. Again, the property was zoned 01 as the -- with the overall development of the Bluff Creek neighborhood, rezoned P -- PUD or PD in 2014. Again, Mr. Palmer went through all this, so I won't reiterate. But it went from 44 units to 39, now to 36, and we've also taken out some additional uses in that Statement of Intent at the request of the neighborhood. Here's a quick little zoning map. You can kind of see right in the middle, the gray area, the gray hatched area, is the piece of property that's in question. Directly to the south of this piece of property is M-OF, as well as to the north. Both of those are office zoned tracts. To the south, it's being used as office. To the north, it's owned by the City of Columbia. On the other side of the bridge, obviously, you have your C -- M-C and M-N on the other side of Grindstone, but then to the east side of this property, this property abuts right up against Highway 63 and across 63 is the industrial development of low-end industrial. The traffic on this piece of property, there have been some concerns with regards to how much traffic this development is going to produce, but it's going to produce significantly less than some of the other previous proposals. The -- the Bluff Creek Drive was originally designed and constructed as a 38-foot-wide curb and gutter street. Thirty-eight foot, at the time, they just had collector, they didn't have major and minor collectors or neighborhood collectors. It's classified as a neighborhood, but honestly, a 38-foot-wide street would be in the classification of a major collector, so it can handle the

traffic. The existing roadway intersections -- and intersections have capacity, so there shouldn't be any issues there, and, of course, the street was designed to handle much more traffic originally as it was zoned for office. Utilities, of course, we're inside the urban service area. Obviously, all City services will be provided for sewer, water, and electric. Stormwater, we're going to address the stormwater like we would on most other projects. This development does have a -- have a place holder, if you will, for a certain limited amount of impervious surface, but we're not going to flood downstream properties. We're going to make sure that we cannot do that. We're going to address those concerns. We're going to develop according to the conceptual stormwater management plan, and we're not going to discharge water onto Pebble Creek Drive or Deer Creek Court. I think some of the neighbors had some concerns downstream that this development is uphill from us, and we're going to discharge our water into the streets and inundate those streets. The way that this piece of property lays, the water will go around, and the City wouldn't allow us to discharge water onto those streets anyway. We're very limited on how much water can go onto the streets, and if there is a little bit, which there may be, it's going to go in the gutter that goes down to Gans Creek and not across the street, so those concerns can easily be -- be addressed with our final stormwater plan. Columbia Imagined, again, you know, residential neighborhoods and proximities to school, we're not super close, but we are in the vicinity of the elementary school. Access to commercial services, right down Bluff Creek Drive, commercial services. Access to open space, just to the north of us is the City trail along Grindstone. This piece of property has direct access to that, with -- as well as the recreational facilities. The Columbia Imagined also talks about support of diverse and inclusive housing options. This is diverse. It's different than what's out there. And mixed uses, I think that this development itself, while it doesn't have mixed uses, it's a component of the whole area that does have mixed uses, with office and varying types of residential. The design adjustment, I believe that Mr. Palmer went into good detail about this, and so I won't hash this out too much, but the -- the issue with residential sprinkler systems is mentioned in the fire code, so it's not -- it's not something that we're coming up with ourselves. It's been used before in other locations and other developments, maybe not in Columbia, but we've used them in other locations, and it is a tool that's listed in the -- in the fire code that says if you go over 30, then we want you to do this. So it's certainly nothing that we were proposing, that we were just coming up with, it's an actual item in the Code. So in conclusion, the proposed development is consistent with the goals and objections of Columbia Imagined. The plan allows for diverse housing options within this portion of Columbia. You know, the plan is significantly consistent with the previously approved plans, and improves on site circulation, parking, and public safety. I think that's important. Again, the fire department has reviewed this plan. They reviewed our turning radiuses, and our accesses and all of that, and they've approved it. And then it comes with you -- it comes before you tonight with, of course, with the support from City staff. And with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I do have a question because I didn't see the answer in your presentation. So I

did see the obvious diversity, which is it's a villa, so that's a different type of housing, but there was also the necessity of inclusion, and what's the definition of inclusion, and how are you meeting that?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, in this piece of property, we're -- we are looking at different housing type. It's going to be a smaller -- smaller lot, smaller house. We're not getting down to what -- it depends upon what the -- what the definition of affordability is. Everyone has a different definition, but we're not getting to that -- that price point. We can't get down that low. So we are -- when I say diversity, we are looking a different housing option that doesn't exist in this location, and so that's what we're looking for.

MS. WILSON: So we're meeting diversity, but not inclusivity?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, in -- it depends on what your definition of -- you know, when we say inclusive, are we talking about, you know, what -- what price point are we hitting at. And I think that the way the market is and the way this piece of property situates, and with regards to making concessions with the neighbors with regards to building materials and building types and architectural feel, I think these homes are probably going to be, you know, a little higher point than -- than what we typically would see in -- in a smaller development like this.

MS. WILSON: Thanks.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Crockett, in regards to the smaller lots, I spent, as many of you know, several years on -- (inaudible) -- where the lots are even smaller than this, folks. As far as a development, I'm interested in how this goes, because normally when we go smaller, we go cheaper, but I appreciate for all the conditions or the requirements you had to meet, we're not going to hit any kind of price point. A question I had and I -- this may be a question more for people who were -- requested it of you. The amenities were eliminated?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, sir.

MR. MACMANN: Let's -- can you talk me through that a little bit?

MR. CROCKETT: I believe that the belief on the part of the residents, that if we included swimming pools and club houses and maintenance field buildings --

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MR. CROCKETT: -- that gave the impression of a rental neighborhood or a student housing complex of some form or fashion, and I believe that they had grave concerns about that. We left them in for quite some time, but that was always a continual sticking point. And so given the fact that we were not proposing them on this PUD plan, we elected to -- excuse me -- PD plan, we elected to remove them since they really didn't apply to our plan itself. But I think that was the reason -- they can speak a little bit more to that -- to that degree, but we had it in there for quite some time, and then we removed it toward the end.

MR. MACMANN: And the last question is, because you're a civil engineer, it intrigues me because I have looked on these small lots before, and where I lived, we had a lot of stormwater issues.

Has this presented any unique problems with you?

MR. CROCKETT: No. It doesn't have any unique situation with regards to stormwater. The City of Columbia also has a regulation that is -- and I won't say it's relatively new, but it's, you know, with the new stormwater regulations, that we have to provide stormwater conduit every -- a box with -- for every six lots. And so it allows us and affords us the opportunity to do much more grading and allows us to -- to concentrate flow and then alleviate a lot of the concerns that we have on the -- the older developments that go for blocks and blocks with no stormwater.

MR. MACMANN: Right. All right. I just -- I just wanted to touch on that because this -- I'm really following this because it is --

MR. CROCKETT: Oh, absolutely.

MR. MACMANN: -- in direction to Commissioner Wilson's point, making these lots smaller to make them more affordable, to make them actually inclusive, these are going to be probably twice what would be an inclusive price point, just to see how the engineering works out over time. All right. Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you, sir.

MS. LOE: Commissioner --

MS. WILSON: I'm sorry. I've got a follow-up question.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. WILSON: So removing the amenities, did it make it cheaper?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, we never -- we never proposed them to start with, so they never were included in the original plan, so they didn't make our plan cheaper. They were just -- those items were listed on the previous Statement of Intent. And so when we modified the Statement of Intent, we just modified the items that directly affected what we technically changed. Since we didn't have those, we didn't change them. The previous plan didn't have them, either. We didn't eliminate them. And so then really the Statement of Intent is kind of a guideline. A lot of times, the Statement of Intent will allow us to have more -- allow us to do more things than what the plan itself calls for. And so we can modify a plan in conjunction with the Statement of Intent. So if we were to come back with a swimming pool or a clubhouse, it would be in the Statement of Intent, we would come back with a revised plan. In this case, we would come back with a revised plan and a revised Statement of Intent. So, yes, they were eliminated, but only because they were on the original plan -- on the original statement that never were removed. I don't know if I confused you on that, ma'am, but --

MS. WILSON: I'm not confused. I followed it.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. WILSON: However --

MR. CROCKETT: Sorry about that.

MS. WILSON: However, you know, in planning, I'm certain that the price point with the amenities

was considered. So it would seem to me that once you removed them, then there should be some reconsideration.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, they never were considered because they never were proposed. They never were a part of the actual plan. We never -- we never had a swimming pool or a clubhouse or those amenities on the actual plan itself. The items weren't removed from the plan, just the allowed uses in the Statement of Intent were removed. So those items were never actually on the -- on our proposal.

MS. WILSON: I understand. Okay.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: So, yeah. From the first time I think we saw this, I never thought that this would be anything close to affordable. This feels to me very much like Old Hawthorne or County Club of Missouri where you've got larger houses, you've got smaller houses, but they're all kind of in that same level of, you know, not furnishings -- finishings -- finishing is the word I'm looking for, the same level of finishings, the same level of architecture materials, things like that. So I guess my question is, am I thinking about this the right way where you're -- you're kind of doing similar to what they did in Old Hawthorne where they have some large houses, and then they have a smaller area?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, I believe that's correct. Yes, ma'am. Because the homes across the street and the other portions of Bluff Creek, they -- they're anywhere from 2,000 square feet to 6,000, 8,000 square feet in size. Obviously, we can't get nearly that size on this piece of property, so we're thinking a smaller home, more in the 1,600, 1,700, 2,000, maybe if you did a story and a half, maybe 2,100, 2,200 square feet, something along those lines, but keep it on that smaller scale, just with the nice finishings. That's correct. Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And you're using the word villas, but these are not maintained yards; right? That three's not going to be -- you have a homeowners association or something that comes and mows everyone's lawns for them. They're -- it's still going to be owner upkeep; is that right?

MR. CROCKETT: That's our intent, yes. We'd like to sell them, yes, for homeowner use.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case?

MR. COX: My name is Sean Cox; I live at 2705 Pebble Creek Drive. Am I allowed to ask for a point of clarification? The waiver that was granted for the sprinkler systems, and that says that the existing homes do not need to be sprinklered is what we're calling it -- sprinklered? They don't have to have fire suppression systems. However, do any future homes that are built, will that be required of them?

MR. ZENNER: It is my understanding, based on the waiver that was granted by the Building Construction Codes Commission, no. It was applicable to the entire Bluff Creek development and all of

the lots platted thereof today.

MR. COX: So any vacant lots that are still existing that have plans to be built on, that would not be required of those lots?

MR. ZENNER: That is my understanding of how that waiver was granted.

MR. COX: Thank you. I appreciate that. As I said, my name is Sean Cox; I live at Bluff Creek, 2705 Pebble Creek. I stand before you as one of the many opponents. I don't have a PowerPoint system, I apologize to the Council on building development.

MS. LOE: Mr. Cox? I'm sorry. Can you just move the microphone down so -- thank you.

MR. COX: Sure. Sorry. Yeah. Since its removal in March 2022, we've had multiple delays in being able to express our opposition to Ms. Ravipudi's proposed plans. These delays, however, have allowed the homeowners to have an actual meeting, an annual meeting, and to meet with Ms. Ravipudi, something that should have been done sooner. I do not need to reiterate the many points of opposition that you all have in front of you from the many neighbors of Bluff Creek, nor do I need to read out the letter from the Bluff Creek HOA, which you also have, that has unanimously opposed this project. What I am going to state is the lack of effort put forth by Ms. Ravipudi to address or take into consideration these concerns. Rather than rectifying her proposal to address concerns, Ms. Ravipudi has been more concerned with garnering letters of support, some of which, I might add, are from homeowners whose houses are currently on the market. I will also wager that there will be more homeowners who put their house on the market if this proposal is approved. It is interesting that on the docket tonight, the second item on the docket is also in Bluff Creek, a proposal to build one residence on six acres as opposed to this one, which is 36 houses on eight acres. These two properties are less than 50 feet apart. Proposed Cotswold Villas development is not conducive with the existing Bluff Creek neighborhood and is a design that is set to gain maximum profit. Its effects will be detrimental. As I was sitting there listening to Mr. Crockett, he brought up a couple of good things which we didn't have answers to last month, stormwater and a few other items which are valuable information. One of the things that was brought up was affordable. It's been answered, it's been asked by a couple of committee members here. It was on the previous staff report that this would be unique affordable home sites. It's not on there anymore, and I think the reason it's not on there anymore is because they're not going to be affordable. The owner developer herself has stated that these will be the \$500,000 to \$600,000 range. The U.S. Housing Authority states -- I have a little bit of a construction background -- states that the median affordability is about \$280,000, so we are well beyond that. It will not be diverse. It will not be inclusive. It will also not fit the existing neighborhood. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Sir, could you help me understand what you would think would be more appropriate for the neighborhood on this property?

MR. COX: I think it could have been developed in a way that was consistent with the existing neighborhood.

MR. MACMANN: Well, could you help me with what that means? Is that bigger lots, bigger houses?

MR. COX: It's lesser density. There is not a lot in Bluff Creek currently that is less than one-third of an acre. These -- this proposal has lots of a tenth of an acre, so the lot sizes are greatly reduced as by the request to reduce the setback lines. So I feel that had we stayed more consistent with the existing neighborhood, we probably could be in a different place right now. I haven't seen the next item on the docket, but I don't think you got too many letters of opposition for that one.

MR. MACMANN: No.

MR. COX: Yeah, I didn't --

MR. MACMANN: Let me ask you one more question. This is not necessarily directed at you, per se, but you live there, you've said you have a construction background. We will probably -- we're starting to see this across the United States right now -- see smaller lots and cheaper houses so people can afford to buy them. In that -- this may be the case. I guess my question is as follows: Because we may be seeing more of this, where should we put those homes that are on the smaller lots and the cheaper prices?

MR. COX: I moved here from Raleigh, North Carolina, and I've been very --

MR. MACMANN: I spent six years out there. Okay.

MR. COX: -- I am very familiar with this problem. I do not know this area enough to say where that should be. I am just looking at the interests of the neighborhood that I currently live in, and I don't think this is going to help the neighborhood, and I don't think it's going to help your question, because these are not going to be affordable when we're looking at what this --

MR. MACMANN: One eight-five is our number here, by the way. About \$185,000 is an affordable home here. But \$280,000 is reachable for working -- yeah. Anyway, we digress. I'm taking your time and your neighbors' time. Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate your allowance.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Mr. Cox, do you have an idea what the average home price on Pebble Creek and Deer Creek is for the existing homes?

MR. COX: I do not. There are three houses that are currently on the market within close proximity to this. One of them just went on the market yesterday for \$1.2 million. There is another one directly across the street that's on the market for \$1.2 million, and there is one around the corner on Deer Creek, which was \$1.3 million. It may have been reduced recently. The house directly across from this that will probably be the most affected by this, is Dr. Cardwell, and he purchased his three years ago for one point something.

MS. BURNS: So to follow up, you -- and, again, I know you're not a realtor listing these properties, but people can ask whatever they like for a property. Do you know what sales in the past year or two years have been on average for Pebble Creek and Deer Creek?

MR. COX: As a matter of fact, there is a house directly across the street from this that did sell

back in March. I don't know the exact amount that it sold for. I believe it went on the market directly across the street for, I think it was around \$500,000, but I don't know the exact number.

MS. BURNS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COX: You're welcome.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would it allay your concerns at all to know that these homes would be priced in the \$500,000 to \$750,000 range?

MR. COX: Would it delay my concerns?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would it allay them? Would you feel better if you knew that?

MR. COX: No. Absolutely I wouldn't. As a matter of fact, I don't feel that that's attainable. We are talking 100 feet from Highway 63. If you had the option of purchasing a \$600,000 home and having a freeway through your backyard, I don't think you would. So I really feel that this is going to probably not bode well for the developer, for the contractor, for the neighborhood. As I said, I believe this is going to be detrimental all around.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you would want -- let's say she did a third of an acre, 24 houses, instead of 36?

MR. COX: I think that would probably be more consistent to the houses that were built in the last couple of years just down the road. There was Horizon Builders, which is, I believe, Sapp built four houses there. They have a buffer area of approximately two acres behind them that runs adjacent to Highway 63 that allows for some type of barrier against the highway. These are going to literally be, as according to the plan when you look at it, they're going to be right up to the setbacks of the highway. I just don't see \$600,000 being realistic.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Haven't been home shopping lately. I -- I appreciate what you're saying. What I am trying to balance is the concerns of you and your neighbor with the rights of the property owner to do something that is well within our build standards. These are well within cottage standards, I believe. There might be -- the five feet maybe slightly off, but, no. This is not an unusual or tight or, you know, overcrowded area, so what I am trying to figure out is what -- what is at the root of the objection.

MR. COX: I think the root of the objection is the density, and that I think the fact that there's an exception to that -- that was given beyond that. As stated, the bridge plan is no longer on the scope of work. It's not in the foreseeable future. So there are other options that, if there was a way to attain a second entrance to go over the 30. If there isn't, and it's not going to be done, why is there an exception to that? Why not keep it at the 30?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure. But that's not a density problem, that's a fire code point of access, and they've reviewed it and said it's safe.

MR. COX: Density problem comes back to what's exactly -- is actually existing in the neighborhood. It's just not conducive to what's there.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. COX: Okay.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: So the way that I'm understanding this is that you would like these properties to look the same as your properties and have the same size footprint as your property. Is that what the concern is?

MR. COX: Well, there wasn't an original -- there wasn't an original request that these properties to be part of our HOA. They're not going to be within the covenants or the guidelines of the HOA or the architectural guidelines of the HOA, so it was denied. So, yeah. That would have been fantastic.

MS. CARROLL: So --

MR. COX: That it would adhere to the architectural guidelines of Bluff Creek, that would have been fantastic.

MS. CARROLL: The request, as a follow-up, if I may. The request for them to -- the new properties to be included in the HOA, was that made by the developer or made by yourselves?

MR. COX: Yes. It was made by the developer.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Sure. Thanks.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case?

MR. BLACKMORE: I'm the old guy. I've been in this subdivision -- My name is Charlie Blackmore. I live 2312 Deer Creek Court. There's a line of property that divides my property from the street where this is proposed to be. The first thing I think we need to say is, thank you, Shelley, for taking on this proposal several years ago when we were faced with much worse proposals and not knowing what could go in there because the way it was zoned and the neighborhood was definitely opposed to having another hospital there, rental property, apartments, and such as that. And Shelley and her husband took this on to make our subdivision a better place to -- to kind of stabilize this eight acres and -- and make it better than what we could have had there a long time ago. So again, I say thank you, Shelley, for doing that. And as far as the homeowners or board being opposed to this, I didn't even know they were opposed to it. I thought we were still in the discussion stages, and I would just like to say, you know, it's -- it's been approved, basically, twice, if not three times, with more -- more homes there than -- than we're looking at now. So I just say my hat is off to Shelley and I think we've got a great thing to do here and I think we ought to go with it. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you.

MS. SCHEBEN: My name is Michelle. I live at 2313 Deer Creek Court, and I've worked in property management, as well as been on the HOA board for Mill Creek Manor about ten years ago. So I took the opportunity -- I'm new to Bluff Creek. I looked at the property, and it's much deeper than people realize whenever -- when they look from the front row to Bluff Creek. It's also -- and I've recently moved back from Folsom, California, and in California, whatever, in Folsom, our population was 80,000. It was smaller. And within -- we lived in American River Canyon, and within American River Canyon, we had

town homes in a two-mile radius. We had town homes -- we had single-family homes, like what's being proposed to be built, and then there was large estates like Bluff Creek currently has. And then with -- at the top of the hill, whatever, there was apartments, and there was a small shopping complex. So within all that, the homes or whatever were not impacted by the diversity of the homes. And what was the draw is whatever, is people of all incomes whatever could come into the neighborhood, and they could live in a nice place to live whatever, and it met all the -- all the needs of everybody. So that was really a plus, and I don't see a downfall into building this. I have talked to Shelley multiple times. I've also, you know, looked at her plans. She's brought down the home volume or, I guess, the density from 39, you know, she's brought it down. She's made some of the back lots a little bit bigger. She stressed issues regarding stormwater where also she's looking at, like, including landscaping or whatever that would sound buffer the freeway, so -- so the noise was addressed. She's put a tremendous amount of time, effort, thought in her proposals, and I don't feel that it was kind of a rush decision and kind of thrown together. And I really feel that this is something that's doable. The price point, I'm not aware of it being to what the last gentleman spoke about being in the five hundreds. I thought there would be a four hundred price point, which is consistent with some of the smaller homes that do exist in Bluff Creek. So -- so recently there was a home that sold, I believe, close to around \$450,000, and it falls within that category, so it is consistent. She also has within her plans the backside of the homes that went align to Bluff Creek, would have the same architectural design or whatever as the front side of the home. So -- so those that live in Bluff Creek Estates, when you drive down or whatever, it has the curb appeal. It looks, you know, pleasing. And so she's put a lot of consideration into what all the residents are looking at and what they would like, and that consists of, you know, all her modifications that we've seen. So I would like to say that I do approve this, and I do feel it might not be for everybody, but it also is a stepping point whatever for, you know, single -- single parents or families that don't have children that want a smaller footprint and would like to live in Bluff Creek Estates. You don't need a 6,000 square foot home, so --

MS. LOE: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker?

MS. THOMPSON: Michelle, I don't believe we caught your last name.

MS. SCHEBEN: Scheben.

MS. THOMPSON: Scheben. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Michelle.

MS. CLARK: My name is Cristen Clark, and I live at 2688 Bluff Creek Drive. And I wanted to just say a couple things in support of this endeavor, and the gentleman who spoke before me had a different experience. I had a wonderful experience with Shelley coming to me, approaching me, talking to me about this project, answering all of my questions. I thought she did a great job. And I did my research, and I actually do live in one of those smaller homes on Bluff Creek Drive. My home is 24 -- 2,490 square feet. And as she said before me, not everybody has the need or desire to live in a really big home. I live by myself. I obviously do not need a 6,000 square foot home, but I also have worked hard, and feel that if I want to live in a nice neighborhood that's safe, that has guidelines, and that I feel like I'm, you know,

going to be in a very nice neighborhood, and the folks who live around me all are very nice and appreciative. And so we do have some smaller homes there, and I want to make sure I had all my notes here. And I think like -- like she said before me, I think these will be a great option for someone like me who wants a safe neighborhood and a nice home without the expense of square footage that a single person just doesn't need. So I support this, and I just thank you for your time.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Clark. Any questions for this speaker? I see none. Thanks. Any additional speakers on this case?

MR. JORDAN: Hello. My name is Dennis Jordan; I live in 5115 Deer Park. So I do not live on Bluff, I do not live on Pebble. I was approached by Shelley a few days ago and she just wanted my knowledge. I'm a local realtor. I've been a realtor for 17 years. Wanted to know about rental. I guess there was a concern with this project about rentals. And for this price point, I think most of these homes are going to be above \$400,000, probably above \$500,000. In my experience in 17 years, I'm not seeing any parents buying rentals for their kids to go to Mizzou in that price point. Everything I see is \$200,000 to \$250,000, \$275,000. New construction prices have gone up a lot, as we all know. Probably looking two to two-twenty a square foot in this neighborhood, so -- minimum. Pebble Creek, I sold in March. That sold for \$475,000. That was kind of a small home over there. Deer Creek, across, 2301 will be on the market in July, and these homes, along with 2401 Bluff Creek is going on the market next week. You're talking 6,000 square feet. A lot of people can't -- you know. They love that neighborhood, but they don't want to maintain that home, so I think this will give them an option to downsize if they want to stay in the neighborhood. That's all I've got.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Jordan. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yes. I was just wondering what your opinion is on whether the -- this new development would affect the home values on the other side of Bluff Creek, or make it a less desirable place to buy?

MR. JORDAN: I -- if there wasn't so much commercial on that street, I would say it could probably have an impact, but you have commercial buildings on that street already, so I think that impact is already there, so --

MS. LOE: I have a question. Homes with smaller lots, is there a trend or interest in buying a home that doesn't have a large lot?

MR. JORDAN: So when I got into the business 17 years ago, you didn't see homes too often under 10,000 square feet, but that's five lots, yeah.

MS. LOE: With lots. Lots, that's --

MR. JORDAN: Sorry.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MS. JORDAN: But in the last probably five years, I'm starting to see the fours, the fives, and six houses for every -- especially if you have a cul-de-sac. That's the only choice you have because you have a pie. So you have a small front -- road frontage, so that hurts them, and it's hard to avoid that.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. JORDAN: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: Any other -- Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Do you find small lot size, smaller home size at this higher price point to be in demand?

MR. JORDAN: I think this price point is the new price point. I don't think it's -- I think that's just where we're at now. I'm involved in a lot of new construction and you're getting closer to \$450,000 to \$500,000 on slabs, and you're already touching \$600,000 on basements now, so we're at that point, especially south of I-70 for the price of lots.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: I would be in agreement with you. New construction and the prices have gone up. I -- I concur with what he says.

MR. JORDAN: And especially if she's going to decorate the back of these homes to make them appealing, you don't see that in neighborhoods. I -- I don't even know if I've ever seen that, so that's impressive.

MS. KIMBELL: Thank you for showing up.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. RAVIPUDI: Before I begin, can I address a couple of items of misinformation from before?

MS. LOE: Can I get your name and address, please?

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Yeah. I'm Shelly Nelson-Ravipudi. I live at 2317 Deer Creek Court. We anticipate the home prices to be in the range of \$400,000 to \$500,000 based on comps -- recent comps I just pulled from southeast Columbia, new construction, so I just want to make that clear that I'm not saying they're going to be \$600,000 to \$750,000. So, okay. I guess I'll begin now. So I've lived in Bluff Creek for over 18 years and I drive past the site every day to enter and exit the neighborhood. And in 2014, we were -- we received notice that modest rental duplexes were going to be built, and the neighborhood was super upset, but they were very happy when my company, Lyon Crest, purchased the property. Lyon Crest is a local female-owned business. Development, property management is what we do. Our most notable property is -- our most notable property is on Rogers Street across from Jefferson Middle School. All right. Here we go. All right. So this is our development on Rogers Street across from Jefferson Middle School. You see the concept drawing that was used during the design and build phase. It was constructed in 2016 at the same time the City was working on their Unified Development Code that was passed in 2017. And this project was often referred to as an example of good infill development. And I also want to point out that the facade features were not required in 2016, but the new Code does have additional design features, architectural standards that are somewhat similar to this. So the point I want to make is that Lyon Crest does have a good reputation for quality despite codes and regulations not existing. Also wanted to say that, you know, we have an opportunity at Bluff Creek now for infill development. And, you know, the surrounding land use and -- has informed our purchasing and rezoning

decisions, and as you know, we have decreased here three times. Originally zoned O-1, I stripped away a bunch of possible uses, including the potential of 17 multi-family units per acre. So that could be viewed as a 70 percent decrease. And then in 2016, we decreased again by 11 percent and recently, after listening to neighbors, another 8 percent. So we're down to 36 units. The idea is to appeal to the market for the millennials and baby-boomers who are competing for the same product have, you know, these houses that are on small lots, but have a big impact, so they live large despite their square footage. Very nice interiors and minimal yard maintenance. I also want to make the exteriors visually interesting, like you see here on Rogers Street, for the people that are driving by, so there are going to be additional standards for the rears of the homes facing Bluff Creek so that the neighbors like myself are happy. This is not a new plan. We have had this past twice before by P&Z and City Council unanimously with no neighborhood opposition. The only reason I'm here today is because there are some unfortunate life events that occurred including my divorce, and so the lot line has expired. Recently, I have been in front of neighbors twice, Zoom meeting, in person. I've knocked on doors. I've had countless one-on-one conversations, hours and hours with neighbors, and I've listened and addressed all concerns that are within my control. And I do want to say that you have a lot of support letters in your packet, and there's more support out there. And I think that it's really notable that a lot of thought were put into these letters, and they weren't written to me as a favor. So, Michelle, up here earlier was speaking about her experience, you know. And one of the things that she did is she called a realtor. After she decided she supported this project, she called a realtor to see if they would actually sell, because she didn't want empty houses sitting there. So she put in a lot of extra effort to really understand the project and realize it's good for our neighborhood. Another person did his own informal traffic survey. I didn't ask him to do that, but very thoughtful. And so I think that speaks volumes about the support that I do have. So thank you.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Ms. Nelson. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yes. A while back, we had a proposal where the developer wanted to have the backs of houses facing more major streets, and the neighbors opposed because they thought that those homes -- homeowners would put fences all along the street and it would be unsightly, and yet they would want the privacy of the tall fence. What do you think about that dilemma of facing the rear of homes toward a major street where you would also have some critical neighbors?

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Well, we -- we don't really like fences in Bluff Creek, but, oh, in Old Hawthorne, that was brought up earlier along some of the, you know, bigger roads. There are a lot of, you know, nice houses where the rear faces the street, and they have landscaped, and it's grown in over the years and it looks really nice. Also, some of the ideas that I have are, you know, for the back patio, I wanted to do, like, a half-wall, so that, you know, it's just a little more privacy for the people that live there, but then also you don't have to look at maybe poor choices in patio furniture or something. So those are just things that have come to mind, but --

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Shelley, shall I address you as Nelson or Ravipudi? I do not --

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: I just changed to Nelson.

MR. MACMANN: I will -- I will do that then. I'm familiar with your Rogers Street development, and you may not remember me, but you interacted with my former business partner, Daniel Culimore -- do you remember Dan -- quite a bit. Where I'm going with all this is you were a very good neighbor there.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: And -- and what Ms. Nelson said is correct. We used -- and Mr. Stanton will remember this. We used their development as an exemplar on some things that we wanted to do. And you were correct. You were not required -- you were grandfathered in. You were not required to do the things that you did do there. Where I'm going with this is, you've got a good reputation, you did good on Rogers Street. I know this personally. Are you going to be a good neighbor in Bluff Creek? That's where I'm going with this because this is what it boils down to. It's, like, what the --

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Exactly. Yes. I will be a good neighbor and, again, I live in that affected area. I live on Deer Creek Court, and that's why I purchased the property. So, yes, I will be.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Well, you -- so far, you've been a good neighbor on Rogers Street, and I guess that's -- there's a lot of concern and I appreciate people's concern on their very significant investments.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: Not necessarily my life experience, but it is a significant investment and I just -
- I hope that you continue to be a good neighbor. Thank you very much.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Okay. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: You know, I do have some concerns about the properties facing the back to the rest of the developments.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Right.

MS. CARROLL: And we're to this -- as Commissioner Placier brought up, I'm appreciative. I like the idea that you have about a short wall and I'm glad that you've put that thought into this. I guess what's concerning to me is the feel of community. We have a similar development come up south of Broadway over at Green Meadows, I believe, when they were talking about inward facing properties being disjointed from the rest of the community. I just -- I guess that I worry that this -- while it is not an affordable housing option, it is a more affordable price point where someone could -- could buy a house in this community. I guess I'd like to see what your thought was in setting this up. I have a concern that it would, especially given that they're not part of the HOA, that I guess that goal of having the neighborhood more available at a slightly more moderate price point might be negated by separating the two communities esthetically.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Well, we can't really have the houses face Bluff Creek Drive because then we would have -- probably would need to have -- well, I guess we could have rear-loading garages.

I don't know. I guess I just always thought about driveways and such, and what will actually work on that property. I really don't have a good answer to that. I'm sorry, but -- yeah. No. I mean, I had an interest in joining the homeowners' association, but there's a lot of objection to that just because the houses are smaller and there's concern about the kind of people that are going to buy smaller houses, so that is a concern, a reason why people want it to be the same as the rest of the neighborhood.

MS. LOE: Any additional questions for this speaker? I see none. Thank you, Ms. Nelson.

MS. NELSON-RAVIPUDI: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Any additional speakers on this case?

MR. WADE: Good evening. My name is Tim Wade; I reside at 2104 Bluff Point Drive, which is on the north side of the Grindstone Creek. I had a question about the development along the west wide of the development. Is there access to the Grindstone Trail? Is there a sidewalk that runs along the east side of the development or is there a fence?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. They're required by the code to construct sidewalk along the entire frontage on Bluff Creek Drive, and then that would further -- their -- their property does not extend all the way north. There's an interceding actual park property there.

MR. WADE: Right.

MR. PALMER: And so they would make the connection to that and then, in the future at some point --

MR. WADE: So there is a sidewalk that runs along the east side of this development?

MR. PALMER: It will be the west side of this development on the --

MR. WADE: Oh, excuse me. West side, yes.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. Yeah. On the east side of the street, so there --

MR. WADE: Is there an easement within the development to the City property in order to access the Grindstone Trail? One of the issues that we -- we have on the north side of the Grindstone Trail on Bluff Point Drive is some wonderful property that backs up to the Moss Waters Wildlife Area, but there is no access to the trail system, and that has to do with the fact that the trail was created after the neighborhood was already in place.

MR. PALMER: They're not -- they're not proposing one, but that sidewalk does provide a connection there, so --

MR. BLACKMORE: I have a question.

MS. LOE: I'm sorry, Mr. Blackmore. We can't take questions from the floor, so -- any questions for Mr. Wade? I see none. Any additional questions -- comments on this case? If there are none, we will close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. LOE: Commissioner comment? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Okay. First of all, this has been through some metamorphosis and I do like the way that it's morphed into its current state. The biggest problem -- the biggest problem, don't say

affordable ever if you don't mean it ever. Half of our conversation up here is because for some marketing -- this is my perspective -- some marketing tool was used to say that we're going to make these affordable. Do not say affordable if you do not mean it ever. I'd rather you would just be realistic. These are not going to be affordable. Don't say they're affordable. Just don't say it. Not dream it, don't guess it, keep it 100 percent real because half of our conversation was about affordability. The way these small lots -- you're right. The real estate agents that discussed these is completely right. Smaller lots, less -- less yardage, that's -- that's the market. We understand the market is -- is very active right now. Four hundred, five hundred thousand dollars for these houses is realistic. This is a capitalist, this is an entrepreneur endeavor. It is designed to make money. Let's keep it real. Let's make it all real. Do not market it as affordable if it's not real. That's my only problem. Other than that, this is a great design. Just don't blow smoke up our behinds to get -- to get the project across the borderline. Don't say it if we don't mean it, because there's people that will call you out on the -- well, somebody said it. It wasn't some kind of literature, whatever. It got out this way. I heard it. Bottom line is that's why I took this, so do not do it if it's not real. I work in affordable housing space. We would like to -- we like hearing that. We don't like it being a lie, and that's where I'm at. So I have to get on a soapbox. Just for future reference, don't say it if you don't mean it. Everything else is great. It meets the market needs. I think you did what you could to work with the neighbors. There can always be more, but I just had to get that affordability issue out. Don't say it if you don't mean it.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Commissioner Stanton. Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. I'm inclined to support this because I see the success of developments like County Club Villas out by the country club. As Commissioner Geuea Jones mentioned, there are larger -- there are homes that have less yard to take care of. And I see Old Hawthorne being developed in this manner, too. So I have to believe that it's successful, that there's a need for this type of development, and so I am inclined to support this.

MS. LOE: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I agree with Commissioner Burns. There are a number of recent developments that are similar in this. We have been asking for a variety of housing types and housing sizes. We've discussed cottage standards quite a bit and have been looking for more applications in that range. I do think this is a housing type that is in need in this city and in demand in this city. I'd like to acknowledge the fact that we cannot, with our zoning codes, ensure that all of your neighbors will have the same footprint as you do. That's not a zoning practice that we can do. If this meets our zoning code, then it meets our zoning code. I plan to support this. I think that it is a good plan in general, and I think that it achieves several of the goals that we have in Columbia Imagined.

MS. LOE: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners do not have any more -- I don't want to jump the gun here, if somebody's got something to say.

MS. LOE: Oh, this is the motion. Okay.

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners do not have any more questions or concerns, I do not want to jump the gun. In the matter of Case 109-2022, Bluff Creek Estates Plat No. 8, revision of SOI and major PD amendment and associated design adjustments as spelled out in 29-5.1, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. KIMBELL: Second.

MS. LOE: Moved by Commissioner MacMann. I'm going to give the second to Commissioner Kimbell, since, Mr. Stanton, you just beat everyone else to punch up until now. So we have a motion on the floor for approval. Any discussion on this motion? If not, Commissioner Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

MS. CARROLL: We have nine votes to approve, the motion is carried.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council.