public records copy

11/16/16

Good evening,

My name is Pat Fowler 606 N Sixth Street. Thank you for the countless number of hours you have spent getting us to this point in the discussion. Having lived in my downtown neighborhood since July 2009 and obtained most of my services and groceries within walking distance of my home, I am in favor of the new ordinance. I want my mixed-use neighbors to prosper equally in our community, taking advantage of the welcoming environment that North Central offers to all.

North Central is the most economically diverse, mixed use, neighborhood in Columbia. We have among our uses 4 schools, one college, 5 churches, 3 homeless shelters, at least 3 social service agencies serving our youth, several in home child care center, housing for persons with disabilities, a lumber yard, a railroad, brewery, a haunted house, a natural gas refueling station, a distillery, an urban farm, bike shop, art gallery, car repair shops, welders, offices, restaurants, a funeral home at Walnut and Ninth, and not so long ago a crematorium on Wilkes. These uses work together because they are in scale.

I want to address Mr. Waters and Mr. Trabue's remarks a few weeks back that my R-1 use under this new code would unfairly control their ability to build on their property and that results in a loss of their property rights.

I am a homeowner among a growing group of homeowners who can afford to buy and live in North Central where we can acquire our forever homes for $100k, most with 2BR and 2BA. Oftentimes our bedrooms are in the attic story. Here's a sketch of the dimensions of mine, it sits 20' x 28', with a 17' peak, on a small lot and is perfectly sized for me to be able to afford and maintain it on my modest salary.

Our investor neighbors paid the same modest price for their properties, invest I suspect as the same rate I do in the repair and maintenance of their structures and in their case, have a revenue stream from their lease to others. Despite our single family uses, the city rezoned us to R-3 in 1964, and yet, in the intervening 52 years, our single family uses persist. It is the highest and best use of our neighborhood to be the most mixed use affordable small footprint neighborhood in our city.

Into this mix, despite our asking Mr. Elliott to include in the new code language that respects this scale and our mixed uses that would encourage increased density within our scale, we are presented with what I would call high density uses, up to 30 feet to the eave line, not including the peak, and nearly 2/3 of a football field long, 200 feet across 6 lots in length. This would

destroy our single family uses, my single-family investment and the benefit that I and my neighbors bring as owner occupieds and long term renters.

We have a living example of what hasn't worked and has impacted more than a dozen property owners along Hubbell Drive and St. Joseph. Only 2 owners still reside in their homes along Hubbell, perhaps 3 along St. Joseph, the others have kept them but moved to another location where they can sleep at night. These were the ordinary consequences of 725 unsupervised young people, some of them old enough to lawfully drink, living in too intense a scale adjacent to our uses. We aren't imagining worst case scenarios, our friends and neighbors lived them.

But there is good news in the new code on pages 212-216 which contains a holding place portion of the code called **detached frontage**. Lift this into service and employ it in a way that increases density, walkability and the consolidation of infrastructure improvements in a healthy way that preserves all our current uses.

We are predominantly 1 and 2 story, with small apartment buildings among us. Our civic buildings are 2 and 3 story; they do not displace us from our current single family uses. Our light industrial uses are good neighbors and do not displace us from our current uses. We enjoy a common setback characteristic of an older neighborhood, where our front porches line up and we can speak to each other from them. The idea in the code of a minimum 25 foot setback in a residential neighborhood is an excellent idea when you are starting from scratch, but not when you are legislating neighborhood protection in a neighborhood 95 years old. We need to be able to keep the median setbacks, better described keep the line our houses currently occupy.

The H3 Charrette Report on page 23 discusses 3 to 5 stories as you transition to our neighborhood. We have that, small apartment buildings like the Waigants's property at Ninth and Park. It's not wider than 2 lots, is 3 stories and has 12 units. The townhouses along Rogers, this is a great example of how the scale matters, they are 2 story and not too deep on the lot. Cougar Village, each building is not wider than 2 lots, not taller than 2 stories with a steeper pitch and contains 8 units. Adding additional structures behind the primary structure, our best example is the Grove family's development at 300 College Ave. A Dutch colonial façade, 26 ft. in height, with an attached similar footprint structure behind it, taking a single-family house to 6 apartments with several bedrooms each.

The property along Hickman Ave, an updated and renovated single-family home which now houses 4 BRs for college students in a location where there is ample parking on street for their cars and they can walk or ride their bikes to campus (and they do, the morning migration is on). Expand the use of accessory dwelling units where we have deep lots, with structures that are smaller yet within scale with the primary building.

Detached frontage would allow increased density and each of us to prosper equally as we continue to welcome more neighbors and more mixed uses into our neighborhood. Please substitute in detached frontage as the neighborhood protection ordinance for North Central Columbia, consider it for other adjacent neighborhoods and protect this affordable housing neighborhood, which at last count numbered 774 affordable addresses that we already have.

I have distributed a handout of the proposed neighborhood protections and neighborhood transitions that do not work for protecting owner occupied and affordable single family rental housing in North Central Columbia.

Our small footprints and commitment to our community is worthy of your support and the policy support of this new ordinance. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Fowler
606 N Sixth Street
fowlerpatriciaj@gmail.com

public record copy

Attachment to Pat Fowler's 11/16/16 remarks

What would work well for neighborhood protection:

On page 212 of the Public Hearing Draft, Detached Frontage:

The introductory paragraph accurately describes our neighborhood.

No greater than 2 stories.

The scale of the buildable area is in keeping with our current uses.

All lots, legal non-conforming included, become buildable, perhaps as the site of what we call Tiny Houses, or skinny houses. We support infill, if it's in scale with our current uses and our infrastructure capacity.

Front porches are good and maintain our existing streetscape.

Page 217, recommend the provision of home based occupations in residential as it serves as a way for the owner-occupied property owner to create a revenue stream that helps maintain their property and their current use as a primary residence.

What would not work well as neighborhood protection:

On page 185 of the Public Hearing Draft, Neighborhood Transitions:

- A 30-ft. eave height, even with additional setbacks is out of scale. This should be lowered to 2 stories as described in Detached Frontage.
- Additional setbacks further erode the streetscape and undermine our current uses. We should honor the median setback in place, the current line of the front porches.
- Parking structures would not be needed if the scale of the use remains compatible.

On page 291 of the Public Hearing Draft, Neighborhood Protections:

These, sadly, would not protect our current uses and the neighborhoods we have created for ourselves. The scale is too vast and would overpower single family owner occupied investment, single family use and displace families and individuals who could not afford the rent in the replacement units. R-MF at 200 feet in length and 35 feet in height at the eave line, plus an attic story, would overpower and displace us from our current uses. The step downs contemplated would disrupt the median setback line and the look and feel of the streetscape. Allowing parking in the side setback with permission of the Director would diminish the single-family occupants use of their property, particularly with elementary and middle school aged kids on bicycles and playing outdoors.

Landscaping as a mitigation measure has not been effective due to restraints in the ability of the city to enforce it and in the lack of intention on the part of some property owners to comply. If we are to have meaningful mitigation with vegetative screens and fencing they should be in place prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit and the city should allocate the necessary resources to ensuring its maintenance.

Patrick Zenner <patrick.zenner@como.gov>

UDC 29-4.5 Table 4.5-2 Transitional Screening and Buffering

j hammen <jrhammen@gmail.com> Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 9:01 PM
To: Patrick Zenner <patrick.zenner@como.gov>
Cc: City Tim Teddy <Timothy.Teddy@como.gov>

Hi Pat,

In 29-4.5 Table 4-5.2 Transitional Screening and Buffering there is no listing for R-2. I am concerned that in the R-MF district a multi-family building being developed next to an R-2 dwelling or use would need no screen or landscape buffer if the R-2 dwelling or use is only considered in the multi-family category.

I'd like to suggest that the Planning and Zoning Commission modify the Table to revise "single-family" to "one & two-family". This revision would be consistent with other references throughout the code where use and zoning district are used and would afford a Level 1 buffer to exist between a two-family dwelling and R-MF dwelling in addition to the Neighborhood Protection standards of "step-down" or increased setback.

Would you please forward this recommendation for the Commissioners review?

Thank you,
Janet Hammen

PLAZA COMMERCIAL REALTY

2501 BERNADETTE DR.
COLUMBIA, MO 65203
PH: 573-445-1020
FAX: 573-445-2613

BUSINESS PROPERTY
LEASING & SALES

To: Tim Teddy
Pat Zenner, please distribute to P & Z Commissioners
From: Paul Land
Re: Adjoining property uses
Date: November 29, 2016

Please share this with Planning & Zoning Commissioners at December 1, 2016 work session on UDC.

Enclosed is an enhanced summary of over 50 current commercial properties adjoining either R-1 or R-2 zoned property.

Under the proposed UDC requirements, these properties will incur reduced height restrictions to 25` and incur additional 10` setback over and above the UDC stipulated setback for their new zoning districts. This will occur if expansion or new building or change of yard storage area occurs. In many instances, those setbacks in UDC have already been increased over the current code setbacks, so an additional 10` will be restrictive. These properties are offered as examples.

I am concerned that imposing this 25` height limitation on commercial property, when it adjoins a residentially zoned R-1 or R-2 property (when R-1 and R-2 has its own 35` height allowable), will have an adverse impact on the commercial property. It can prevent such commercial property from remodeling, expanding, or adding another facility on this site. This is a problem when that value of expansion was initially evaluated as part of the commercial property end user goals as a purchaser.

I respectfully request commissioners' eliminate this 25` height restriction when commercial or office property adjoins residential.

Further the screening requirement should be re-considered. There are instance when the building itself forms the preferred visual buffering to adjoining residential, or instances where a site grade differential exists that is more meaningful. Placing a fence in front of, or on top of, a significant grade differential is not necessary.

PAUL LAND, SIOR
Owner
landreal10@aol.com

www.PaulLand.com
SIOR Individual Membership
Society of Industrial and
Office REALTORS®

MIKE GRELLNER, SIOR
Vice President
mikegrellner@plazarealestate.com

11/16/2016

		CURRENT ZONING			PROPOSED ZONING		
	Business/Address	**Current Zoning District**	**Current Height Regulation**	**Adjoining Property Zoning**	***Zoning***	***Re-Develop Height Regulation***	***Plus set back Requirement***
1.)	Olive Garden I-70 Dr. SW	C-3	45`	R-1	*M-C*	***25`***	*plus 10` & screen*
2.)	Aguave Restaurant & Teppanyaki Restaurant I-70 Dr. SW	C-3	45`	R-2	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
3.)	Hillyard Chemical Comfort Products Burlington St.	C-3	45`	R-1	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
4.)	U-Haul Rental Business Loop	M-1	no limit	R-2	*I-G*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
5.)	True Media Business Loop/Orange St.	C-3	45`	R-2	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
6.)	PCE Construction Tower Dr.	M-P	negot	R-1	*P-D*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
7.)	Lakewood Lawn & Garden Vandiver Dr.	C-1	35`	R-1	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
8.)	A-1 Rental Vandiver Dr.	C-P	35`	R-1	*P-D*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
9.)	THH Engineers, J-2 Scientific Pennsylvania	M-1	no limt	R-1	*I-G*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
10.)	Watlow Electirc Vandiver Dr.	M-1	no limit	R-1	*I-G*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
11.)	Central Bank of Boone County W. Broadway	C-1	35`	R-1 (to east)	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
12.)	Charles Hatley Denistry Forum Blvd.	C-1	35`	R-1	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
13.)	Case Power & Equipment Prathersville Rd.	C-P	negot	R-1	*P-D*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
14.)	Westside Swim Club W. Broadway	C-1	35`	R-1	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*

		CURRENT ZONING			PROPOSED ZONING		
	Business/Address	Current Zoning District	Current Height Regulation	Adjoining Property Zoning	*Zoning*	*Re-Develop Height Regulation*	*Plus set back Requirement*
15.)	CC Broiler Forum Blvd	C-3	45`	R-1	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
16.)	Boone Hospital South W. Nifong	C-P	negot	R-1	*P-D*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
17.)	Woodrail Centre W. Nifong & Forum	C-P	45`	R-1	*P-D*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
18.)	Northwest Office Plaza I-70 Dr. SE	C-3	45`	R-1	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
19.)	Lindsey Rental Sexton	C-3	45`	R-1	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
20.)	Vanderveen Plaza (Gumby's et al) Hwy 763 & Rainforest Pkway	M-1	no limit	R-1	*I-G*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
21.)	MFA Oil Company Eastpointe Dr./Ray Young Dr.	O-1	45`	R-1	*M-OF*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
22.)	Shelter Insurance (Broadway Shopps) W. Broadway	C-P	negot	R-1	*P-D*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
23.)	Woodridge Center I-70 Dr. SE	C-1	35`	R-2	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
24.)	Inside the Lines Texas Ave.	C-3	45`	R-1	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
25.)	Socket Enterprises Clark Lane	C-3	45`	R-1	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
26.)	College Springs Plaza Stadium Blvd & Old Hwy 63	C-3	45`	R-1 (north side)	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
27.)	Alzheimer's Association Bluff Creek Dr.	O-1	45`	R-1	*M-OF*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
28.)	Hobart MFG Nellwood Dr.	M-1	no limit	R-2	*I-G*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*

		CURRENT ZONING			PROPOSED ZONING		
	Business/Address	Current Zoning District	Current Height Regulation	Adjoining Property Zoning	Zoning	Re-Develop Height Regulation	Plus set back Requirement
29.)	Biggest Bar & Grill Paris Rd.	M-1	no limit	R-2	*I-G*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
30.)	Green Meadows Clinic (Formerly MU Health) S. Providence Rd.	O-1	45`	R-1 PUD	*M-OF*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
31.)	Broadfield Plaza Broadway Business Park (West of Broadway HyVee)	C-1	35`	R-1	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
32.)	United Methodist Church Park DeVille Dr. & Broadway	C-1	35`	R-1	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
33.)	Office Bldg. Portion of Cherry Hill Dr.	C-P	negot	R-1	*P-D*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
34.)	HyVee W. Broadway & Fairview	C-1	35`	R-1	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
35.)	Walmart Anchored Center Fairview Marketplace W. Broadway & Fairview	C-1	35`	R-1	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
36.)	Hal Fischer Accounting W. Ash St.	O-1, C-1	45`	R-1	*M-OF*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
37.)	Vacant Land N. Stadium (North of Primrose)	M-1	no limit	R-2	*I-G*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
38.)	Knights of Columbus N. Stadium	C-1	35`	R-2	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
39.)	Daycare N. Stadium	C-1	35`	R-2	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
40.)	University Subaru I-70 Dr. SW	C-1	35`	R-1	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
41.)	City of Columbia Health Clinic W. Worley	C-1	negot	R-1	*P-D*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
42.)	Dairy Queen Stadium & Highridge/Forum Blvd.	C-1	35`	R-1	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*

		CURRENT ZONING			PROPOSED ZONING		
	Business/Address	Current Zoning District	Current Height Regulation	Adjoining Property Zoning	Zoning	Re-Develop Height Regulation	Plus set back Requirement
43.)	Veteran's United Killgore's Pharmacy et al Chapel Hill Plaza Chapel Hill Plaza Ct. at Chapel Hill	C-P	negot	R-1	*P-D*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
44.)	Missouri Country Club Forum Blvd.	C-3	45`	R-1 / PUD	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
45.)	Plaza Tire Smiley Lane	C-3	45`	R-1	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
46.)	Spencer Crest Condo's Hwy 763 & Kennesaw Ridge	C-3	45`	R-1	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
47.)	Phoenix House Leslie Lane	C-P	negot	R-1	*P-D*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
48.)	Seven Oaks Office Plaza Campusview Dr.	C-1	35`	R-1	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
49.)	Sterling Dental Clinic Buttonwood Dr.	O-1	45`	R-2/R-1	*M-OF*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
50.)	Fed Ex Maquire Blvd.	M-C	no limit	R-1	*I-G*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
51.)	Arena Liquor Rt. PP	C-1	35`	R-2	*M-N*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
52.)	Kia of Columbia Business Loop	M-1	no limit	R-2	*I-G*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
53.)	Midwest Roofing Paris Rd.	M-1	no limit	R-2	*I-G*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*
54.)	Semco MFG Eastpointe Dr.	C-3	45`	R-1	*M-C*	*25`*	*plus 10` & screen*

For the public Record

P&Z Remarks on 29-4.8_11/16/16

Hello, my name is Janet Hammen. My address is 1844 Cliff Dr. The East Campus Neighborhood Association is my neighborhood association.

I appreciate the Commission holding these public hearings and the many, many hours you have incurred for the betterment of our city. This new zoning and building code will be a great achievement. Part of these changes will be Section 29-4.8 Neighborhood Protection Standards.

I have lived in the East Campus Neighborhood for almost 40 years. For the entirely of that time the ECNA and neighbors have fought against the unjust rezoning of our neighborhood and the deterioration of the historic homes, neighborhood character and streetscape. The East Campus Neighborhood Historic District is the largest residential historic district in Columbia. Section 29-4.8 intent states and I quote, "This section is intended to preserve the residential neighborhood character of established homes within multi-family districts and adjacent to Mixed Use or Special zoning districts." Section 29-4.8 offers the potential to protect neighborhood character of the central city neighborhoods such as East Campus, Benton-Stephens and North-Central.

To realize that potential however, revisions are necessary to the version contained in the draft UDO. The revised copy that has been passed out contains several changes that will, in fact, preserve the neighborhood character as the intent of Section 29-4.8 states.

These are highlighted in bold type in the revised 29-4.8 version.

(b) Applicability applies to any lot or dwelling zoned R-1 or R-2 or has R-1 or R-2 use.

(c) Median Setback. To protect a streetscape and neighborhood, new construction should adhere to median setback of the entire block on the same side of the street.

That is the manner in which setbacks have been, or should have been, determined in established neighborhoods and should continue. To allow any thing else, disallows preserving streetscape and allows frontage creep. Having Staff measure allows for a public record.

(d) Building Height. To truly protect neighborhood character and any dwelling or lot zoned or in R-1 or R-2 use, both building height step-down and increased side and/or back yard setbacks need be employed.

(e) Screening and Buffering. Screening and buffering protection needs to be applied to R-1 and R-2 dwellings or lots.

(f) Parking, Loading, and Circulation. (1) Single-family or two-family districts need to be included. (2)If this clause applies to a proposed construction, the director

should not have discretion to allow a parking lot next to a R-1 or R-2 dwelling or lot. That would negate the intention of (1) and not protect the R-1 or R-2 dwelling or lot.

(g)Lighting Height. A light on a twenty-foot pole can still be disruptive; therefore this clause needs additional provisions.

(h) Building Mass and Lot Size. If we are serious about not destroying the existing residential neighborhood character of established homes in affordable and/or historic neighborhoods, then there must be a further limitation on new construction than what is proposed in the UDO draft.

These suggested revisions will help preserve the residential neighborhood character of established homes, but deprive no one of his or her property rights.

Thank you,

Janet Hammen

11/16/16

11/16/16
(1)

Columbia Development Code Public Hearing Draft

29-4.8 Neighborhood Protection Standards

(a) Intent

This section is intended to preserve the residential neighborhood character of established homes within multi-family districts and adjacent to Mixed Use or Special zoning districts.

(b) Applicability

These standards apply:

(1) To all lots in the R-MF district that contain a principle use other than a single- or two-family dwelling; *and*

(2) To all lots located in any zone district other than the R-1 and R-2 districts that shares a side or rear lot line with a lot in the R-1 or R-2 district, **is zoned R-1 or R-2 or is has R-1 or R-2 use.**

(c) Median Setback

The median setback of all buildings on the same side of the street in the same block shall apply. The median setback of existing buildings on the same side of the street in the same block shall apply to vacant land. The median setback shall be determined by City staff.

(d) Building Height

Buildings constructed after the effective date of this Code with a height greater than twenty-four (24) feet shall reduce the perceived height of the building when viewed from abutting lots **as follows:**

(1) "Stepping down" building height of any portion of the building within twenty-five (25) feet of the side and rear lot lines to a maximum of twenty-four (24) feet.

(2) Increasing the side yard and rear yard setbacks a minimum of ten (10) feet beyond that otherwise required in the zone district where the property is located.

e) Screening and Buffering

The standards of Section 29-4.5(e) apply. In addition, when the standards of that Section require the construction of an opaque wall or fence, the following applies:

(2)
11/16/16

(1) If the applicant's property is in the R-MF district, the required landscaping shall be installed on the side of the fence or wall facing towards the adjacent lot with a single- or two- family dwelling; and

(2) If the applicant's property is in any other district except the R-1 or R-2 districts, the required landscaping shall be installed on the side of the fence or wall facing towards the R- 1 or R-2 district **or dwelling.**

(f) Parking, Loading, and Circulation

(1) No parking area, drive-through lane, or vehicle circulation driveway shall be located between a principal structure on a lot containing a use other than a single- or two-family use and any side property line abutting a lot containing a single- or two-family dwelling **or district.**

(2) If the context of a site makes subsection (1) above impractical, the Director may approve a parking lot design that locates a drive-through lane, vehicle circulation driveway, or a combination of these two site planning elements, in the area described in subsection (1) above, provided both site planning elements are located at least six (6) feet from an adjacent lot containing a single- or two-family dwelling or district and the six (6) foot buffer is landscaped according to Section 29-4.5(e).

(g) Lighting Height

The maximum height of any lighting pole within fifty(50) feet of the side or rear lot lines shall be 20 feet.

(h) Building Mass and Lot Size

To allow for density in scale with the residential neighborhood character, buildings constructed may be no more than 100 feet along the address side of a property or be constructed on more than two adjoined or replatted lots.

12_11_16 #2

Columbia Development Code Public Hearing Draft 29-4.8:

Neighborhood Protection Standards

How to read this document:

New, additional or changed wording is presented in bold type and underlined.

Comments, which are not part of the document, are presented in italics and highlighted.

All other, non-bolded words and sentences are in the draft UDO.

29-4.8 Neighborhood Protection Standards

(a) Intent

This section is intended to preserve the residential neighborhood character **and affordability** of established homes within Multi-family districts and adjacent to Mixed Use or Special zoning districts.

(b) Applicability

The use of the neighboring property or properties shall determine the applicability of this section.

Citizen comment: Above underlined sentence added for clarity.

These standards apply:

(1) To all lots in the R-MF district that contain a principle use other than a single- or two-family dwelling; and

(2) To all lots located in any zone district other than the R-1 and R-2 districts that share a side or rear lot line with a lot in the R-1 or R-2 district **or share a side or rear lot line with an R-1 or R-2 use.**

Citizen comment: New underlined text above added for clarity.

(c) Median Setback

The median setback of all buildings on the same side of the street in the same block shall apply. The median setback of existing buildings on the same side of the street in the same block shall apply to vacant land.

A public record of existing setbacks shall be established upon the effective date of this code. Setback measuring of all buildings on the same side of the street in the same block will be triggered by demolition permit

applications and replat applications. Demolition or replat shall not happen until the setback record for that block is created.

Citizen comment: It is important to retain the current standard of determining front yard setback in R-MF neighborhoods. If all lots in a block on the same side of the street are measured and the median setback determined, the front yard setback will always remain the same for that block and side of street. The line of the buildings will not change and will not have the possibility to creep forward over time. The front yard setback will remain the same if one or more lots are redeveloped or one lot today and another in five years.

For example: if seven lots on Hinkson measure 48, 48, 61, 61, 61, 65, 36.5, the median is 61. To determine the median, sort the list in ascending order then pick the middle value.

This method will establish front yard setbacks for each block in which redevelopment takes place and means less time for staff in the future and assures reliability for neighborhood citizens.

Clarion comment dated 8/12/16 (pg. 20): "This process reduces the large variations in setbacks along street frontages and potentially will, overtime, unify the street frontage at a consistent building front location. The issue of median front setbacks is mostly limited to the UC-O zones and can be address through provisions contained within those specific overlays."

Citizen comment: The Clarion comment does not protect neighborhood character and streetscape but, instead, alters it according to redevelopment. Further if there is no UC-O zone the neighborhood is left unprotected. Further, Clarion's approach assumes all lots will be redeveloped to get to common setback.

(d) Building Height

(1) In R-MF district: Buildings constructed after the effective date of this Code with a height greater than twenty-four (24) feet shall reduce the perceived height of the building when viewed from abutting lots as follows:

(i) "Stepping down" building height of any portion of the building within one hundred (100) feet of the side and/or rear lot lines to a maximum of twenty-four (24) feet.

Clarion comment: Clarion's recommended Neighborhood Protection Standards "stepping down" building height presented in every draft including October 2015

until this last draft was: "stepping down building height of any portion of the building within one hundred (100) feet of the side and rear lot lines to a maximum of thirty (30) feet.

Citizen comment: Don Elliott from Clarion has recommended "step-down" within one hundred (100) feet of R-1 or R-2 side or rear lot line to protect neighborhood character. The overwhelming majority of dwellings in R-MF districts are single- or two-story houses. To retain consistency within R-MF neighborhoods and preserve neighborhood character, a maximum of twenty-four (24) feet should be required to "step-down" building heights within one hundred (100) feet of R-1 or R-2 dwellings or uses.

(2) **In other applicable districts**: Buildings constructed after the effective date of this ordinance with a height greater than twenty-four (24) feet shall reduce the perceived height of the building when viewed from abutting lots by using at least one (1) of the following techniques.

(i) "Stepping down" building height of any portion of the building within twenty-five (25) feet of the side and rear lot lines to a maximum of twenty-four (24) feet.

(ii) Increasing the side yard and rear yard setbacks a minimum of ten (10) feet beyond that otherwise required in the zone district where the property is located.

e) Screening and Buffering

The standards of Section 29-4.5(e) apply. **In addition, if the applicant's property is in the R-MF district and the abutting property is in R-1 or R-2 use or district, a 6-ft deep landscape buffer (level 1) is required.**

Citizen comment: Standards of Section 29-4.5(e) treat R-2 district or use as a multi-family and does not require any screening and buffering.

Clarion comment dated 8-12-16 (p. 19): The screening standard would apply when the more intense use is abutting a lot containing a single or two-family use.

(f) Parking, Loading, and Circulation

(1) No parking area, drive-through lane, or vehicle circulation driveway shall be located between a principal structure on a lot containing a use other than a single- or two-family use and any side property line abutting a lot containing a single- or two-family use or district.

(2) If the context of a site makes subsection (1) above impractical, the Director may approve a design that locates a ~~**parking area,**~~ drive-through lane,

vehicle circulation driveway, or a combination of these **two** site planning elements, in the area described in subsection (1) above, provided **both** site planning elements are located at least six (6) feet from an adjacent lot containing a single- or two-family dwelling **and the six (6) foot buffer is landscaped according to Section 29-4.5(e). Applicant may appeal to the Board of Adjustment.**

Clarion comment dated 8-12-16 (pg. 17): Provision may need to be created that will restrict certain features within side yards between higher (R-MF and greater) and R-1 or R-2 zoning districts or single-family or two-family dwellings.

Citizen comment: To allow a parking area in a side yard in (2) would negate the protection of (1) and defeats the purpose of the protection. This may be a situation when a use variance is applied for.

(3) When an R-MF structure adjoins an R-1 or R-2 use at the side or rear lot line, parking with additional buffering shall be in the rear, behind the structure.

(g) Lighting Height

The maximum height of any lighting pole within fifty (50) feet of the side or rear lot lines shall be 20 feet **with downward cast illumination to prevent glare in neighboring dwelling(s).**

(h) Density in Scale

(1)To allow for density in scale with the residential neighborhood character, in the R-MF district, buildings constructed may be no more than 100 feet along any street frontage of a property. All newly constructed non-accessory structures shall have gabled or hip roofs with pitches having a minimum slope of four units vertical in twelve units horizontal.

Citizen comment: Including (h) (1) insures that residential neighborhoods, although zoned R-MF, shall be protected per the intent of 29-4.8 Neighborhood Protection Standards.

Citizen comment: neighborhood overlays can protect R-MF neighborhoods more completely than these Neighborhood Protection Standards but most R-MF districts do not have an overlay to rely and so 29-4.8 is vital to protect the neighborhood character and affordability of established homes within Multi-family districts.

(2) In all zone districts other than the R-1, R-2 and R-MF districts that share a side or rear lot line with a lot in the R-1 or R-2 district or use, building size shall meet Design Standards and Guidelines 29-4.7.

Neighborhood Protection Photos, Janet Hammen

Illustrations of structures that meet 35' eave measurement (Section 29-4.8(h) of UDC)

Accompanies J. Hammen's proposed changes submitted 12/8/16 to same section of UDC



Bass Avenue



Ross Street



Rosemary Lane



Wilson Avenue

December 11, 2016

Dear Commissioners,

In reference to 29-4.8 Neighborhood Protection Standards Building Height, Don Elliott from Clarion has recommended "step-down" of any portion of the building within one hundred (100) feet of R-1 or R-2 side or rear lot line to protect neighborhood character. Since the overwhelming majority of dwellings in R-MF districts are single- or two-story houses, to retain consistency within R-MF neighborhoods and preserve neighborhood character, a maximum of twenty-four (24) feet should be required to "step-down" building heights within one hundred (100) feet of R-1 or R-2 dwellings or uses.

The one hundred (100) foot recommendation was included in every UDO draft until this latest one. Please reinstate the one hundred (100) foot building height "step down" in R-MF districts.

Thank you,

Janet Hammen

Building Height

(1) In R-MF district: Buildings constructed after the effective date of this Code with a height greater than twenty-four (24) feet shall reduce the perceived height of the building when viewed from abutting lots as follows:

(i) "Stepping down" building height of any portion of the building within one hundred (100) feet of the side and/or rear lot lines to a maximum of twenty-four (24) feet.

(2) **In other applicable districts**: Buildings constructed after the effective date of this ordinance with a height greater than twenty-four (24) feet shall reduce the perceived

height of the building when viewed from abutting lots by using at least one (1) of the following techniques.

(i) “Stepping down” building height of any portion of the building within twenty-five (25) feet of the side and rear lot lines to a maximum of twenty-four (24) feet.

(ii) Increasing the side yard and rear yard setbacks a minimum of ten (10) feet beyond that otherwise required in the zone district where the property is located.

CRAWFORD
CONSTRUCTION, INC.

1306 Old Highway 63 South, Suite F
Columbia, MO 65201
Phone (573) 875-1250 · Fax (573) 874-8656

11/30/16

City of Columbia
Mr. Pat Zenner
Mr. Tim Teddy
Members of Columbia Planning & Zoning Commission

Re: Columbia UDC – Columbia Development Code Public Hearing Draft
Requested changes to Section 29 – 4.8 (e)

Mr. Zenner, Mr. Teddy, and Members of Columbia Planning & Zoning Commission,

As I addressed at a previous meeting, there are direct conflicts between Section 29 – 4.8 (e) of the UDC and the Columbia Fire Code (2015 International Fire Code). I appreciate the Commissioners giving serious consideration to the questions and concerns which are raised by the public. I work in this industry every day, and believe it is extremely important for the Commissioners to have this information. I am asking that you delete section 29-4.8 (e) from the UDC draft that is sent to the Council due to the conflict.

Request: Section 29-4.8 (e) Parking, Loading, and Circulation:

Delete Section (e), in its entirety, as it directly conflicts with the 2015 International Fire Code. The fire code requires access and drives to within 150 feet of all portions of a building. As a practical matter, this means you need access to all sides of a building unless it is extremely small. Refer to Chapter 5, Section 503 of the 2015 International Fire Code, and additionally refer to Appendix "D" Fire Apparatus Access Roads. Chapter 503.1.1 details Fire Apparatus Access Roads to within 150 feet of all portions of a building. In Addition, Appendix D104.1 details TWO Access Roads for many types of buildings. For anyone to suggest that these details do not require fire roads or lanes for over 95% of all Commercial or Multi-family structures would suggest that they misunderstand the code. To rely on the director to approve deviations from subsection (e) would require such a judgment to be made on most, if not all projects that are adjacent to R-1 & R-2 lots, which are located in a large number of locations around town.

There are buffer requirements assigned to these areas in other parts of the code, so there is a provision for buffering and protection already in place to protect the neighboring property.

In addition to the Fire Code conflict, prohibiting Drives, Parking, and Circulation, would have the same effect as a Rezoning or zoning change. (i.e.… It would be a taking and alteration of existing zoning and property rights.) As a result, this would be detrimental to these properties. Per recent council decisions, it is clear that the council does not want changes to have a detrimental effect on any property.

Sincerely,

Mark Crawford
Crawford Construction Inc.