

**MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
MAY 21, 2026**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

**Ms. Sharon Geuea Jones
Mr. David Brodsky
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Mr. Robert Walters
Ms. McKenzie Ortiz
Dr. Les Gray
Mr. Cody Darr**

STAFF

**Mr. Pat Zenner
Mr. David Kunz
Mr. Ross Halligan
Mr. Jesse Craig**

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. GEUEA JONES: Good evening, and welcome to the Thursday, May 21st, 2026, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting of the City of Columbia.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky, may we please have a roll call?

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: I am here. Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: We have a quorum of seven.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, are there any changes or adjustments to the agenda?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, there will be, ma'am. We are going to move Case Number 135-2026 forward in the agenda under public hearings. So it will become the first public hearing, with 91-2026 being heard as the second hearing. That is to ensure that there is quorum due to absence that we will have following

that first case.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. With that adjustment, is there a motion to approve the agenda?

DR. GRAY: Move to approve.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Gray, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Thumbs up approval of the agenda?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous. Thank you.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MS. GEUEA JONES: There was a slight issue with the transcript, and therefore, the minutes of our May 7, 2026 regular meeting, rather than asking for approval of those minutes, I'd like to ask tonight that we table those minutes until next week to give everyone a chance to send their adjustments to staff. Does anyone have an objection to that course of action? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'd like to entertain a motion, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please go ahead.

MR. STANTON: I move to table the meeting minutes from May 7th regular meeting.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Gray. Is there any discussion on that motion? I know it's a little unusual, but I think that there's significant issues. Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: So just to clarify, we will send the adjustments to whom?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner.

DR. GRAY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further discussion? Seeing none. Is thumbs up approval okay on this motion? All right. Thumbs up approval to table?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. And everyone, please do review those minutes. We are very grateful to our staff for doing those minutes, and this is just an unusual circumstance. So thank you. Very good. All right.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case Number 135-2026

A request by Engineering Surveys and Services (agent), on behalf of Jeffrey E Smith Investment Co LC (owner), for approval to rezone 3.15-acres of property from the R-MF (Multiple-family Dwelling) district to the M-N (Mixed Use - Neighborhood) district. The subject site is located directly northeast of the intersection of Bethel St and Diego Drive, and is presently unaddressed.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning of the site from R-MF to M-N.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, or have reason to recuse themselves from this vote, please say so now.

MR. DARR: Madam Chair, I would like to recuse myself.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner Darr. You may be recused. Please leave the room, and we'll call you back after the vote has concluded. Anyone else? Seeing none. Any questions for staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any public comment on this case? Please come forward.

MS. THOMPSON: My name is Sarah Thompson; I work for Engineering Surveys and Services, at 1113 Fay Street, and am the representative for Jeffrey Smith in this rezoning case. I want to thank staff for preparing all of that information and going through that so quickly. And all the history of this site, it is important to note that it has existed since 2009, and that it's still vacant, so there's definitely a need for development in this area, especially since it already has all of the utilities applicable to development. I think the most important thing to prioritize in this rezoning is the infill opportunity for the City, and along with that, that it is in a high-growth priority area, and what's provided in this area and how it can benefit in service and support the neighboring communities. So I wanted to just state that this is being rezoned to help improve the marketability for the site in the future. If it -- for whatever development it is, there isn't any plan right now, but hoping that by rezoning this, it opens up the opportunity for more to benefit the community. So we're asking you for your support for this request, and appreciate your time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much for your presentation.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward. Please state your name and address for the record, and then please continue.

MS. WOODS: Anne Woods, 3711 Santiago Drive. I just live north of this area. I mean, adjacent. I look upon this. And I would just like to say we have lots of drive-throughs, and they don't go slow in our -- through our parking lots. So if this is developed in an aggressive way, there's going to be a lot of drive-throughs. And then we have semi parking on the other side as it is right now. Two semis park on Diego Drive, and I don't know if it will be more or less or whatever, but that's the situation it is right now. Thank you.

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

MR. WALTERS: I do, quickly.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: Are you saying there is more cut-through traffic on Santiago Drive. Is that -- you're saying right now you do?

MS. WOODS: No. No. The parking area -- the parking area --

MR. WALTERS: On Diego?

MS. WOODS: -- that's just north on the north perimeter -- there.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Okay.

MS. WOODS: It's the parking lots of the apartment buildings.

MR. WALTERS: I live in this neighborhood, too, and I've seen those trucks there from time to time, and they just need to be reported. Someone just needs to report that they're illegally parking there,

I think.

MS. WOODS: Oh, I thought -- I thought they were allowed to park there, that's all.

MR. WALTERS: Well, I -- for a short term, they are, I think.

MS. WOODS: Oh, okay. Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward.

MS. HILDEBRAND: Hello. My name is Pamela Hildebrand; I live at 3850 Bethel Street. I live in the apartments that are just to the north. And does anybody know what they plan to -- if they're going to use it for, you know, a business, or offices or -- because we would like to know, because we're the ones that are affected by it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: There -- there is no plan here. This is just saying that it could be used for it. They will have to go through building codes and all of that stuff when someone purchases it and plans to develop it. But right now, there are no specific plans.

MS. HILDEBRAND: Okay. All right. Well, as I understand it, Fairway Management or JES, Jeff Smith owns that property. And my concern is that I lived in one of his developments, and we get no service, and our place is going to heck in a handbasket. I cleaned it up. So, you know, my concern is that it needs to be maintained whatever they build and -- because that will affect us.

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

MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward.

MS. BARBERO: My name is Cheryl Barbero, and I also live at 3850 Bethel, Apartment 201. And that is, like, right in our front yard. And my concern is -- I'm sorry.

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

MS. BARBERO: My concern is there's a lot of, like, drainage, you know, like sewer systems in that little culvert area, that little grassy area. And I know I was talking to another lady who said it was her understanding when she moved in that it wasn't ever going to be built on, and that -- that was because of those culverts and the wastewater. Where is that wastewater going to go if somebody builds on it? There's -- you know, there's a lot of water that runs through there, and I'm wondering where it's going to go -- into our apartments? Because, like she said, they're not taken care of and if this company builds on that site, I'm kind of, you know, afraid of what else we aren't going to get done at our place. And we are all older people, we're 62 and over, and, you know, we deserve some respect. And I -- I don't think that's usually taken into account what it's going to do to the people who live right there. And, you know, we have -- we have a nice -- we have a nice apartment, but, you know, some of the stuff is falling apart. But there are cars that drive through between Bethel Street and Santiago through our parking lot. And I won't even park on the -- on that side of the -- in that side of the parking lot because I don't walk very fast, and I'm afraid that somebody is going to come racing through there and knock me down. And that is a real fear, and it is a real fear for a lot of people. My friend, Pam, she doesn't -- she doesn't walk very fast, either. So, you know, we're kind of concerned about the traffic that will go -- I mean, that's private property, but it doesn't stop people from driving through there anyway. It didn't stop, you know, those criminals drove in there really fast thinking they were getting away, and, you know, had to abandon the car and run. So, you know, I'm just concerned about that. The traffic and the wastewater and, you know, isn't -- isn't there some, you know, ordinance that says that the sewer systems have to stay? And that's it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, ma'am. And to answer your question, the building codes will tell them they have to do wastewater management, and that will be part of that process. Any other questions for this speaker?

MR. WALTERS: I have a --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: I have a question. You and the prior speaker, you live in this -- in a Jeffrey Smith development. Correct?

MS. BARBERO: Yes.

MR. WALTERS: And do you have -- you have an advocate for you in terms of -- do you have an on-site project manager that you can communicate your concerns to?

MS. BARBERO: No. We don't have any property management. We wouldn't have a property manager for a long time. There have been -- I've lived there six years, and I've had ten different managers, at least, and maybe more than that. I don't even keep track of them anymore. I don't even learn their names anymore because one of them was there for two days. One was supposed to be there and was a no call, no show. And then if we do get somebody good in, there is a really hateful manager -- middle manager who fires them. So we can't get anything -- we can't -- it took me four months to get my lease signed because there was no manager. You know, that's unacceptable.

MR. WALTERS: My point -- my point was going to be maybe a -- well, do you have any traffic calming, any traffic bumps to this area that people were speeding through?

MS. BARBERO: (No audible answer.)

MR. WALTERS: Well, perhaps, and this may be naive on my part, you could circulate a petition and get it to the management to request that, at least. I know --

MS. BARBERO: Well that's really funny. We've been trying to -- I've been trying to get an ice maker for six months.

MR. WALTERS: Well, maybe if 60 or 80 people signed a letter, maybe -- maybe they'll pay attention.

MS. BARBERO: Maybe I'll get my ice maker? All right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you, ma'am, for being here. Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward. Seeing none. We will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comment. Are there any Commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Can I ask a follow-up question of staff?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. Go ahead.

DR. GRAY: In this zoning, drive-throughs are not a by-right use?

MR. KUNZ: That's correct. It's a conditional use, so there would be another public hearing that would be necessary should a drive-through facility be requested for any use that is developed on the site.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further Commissioner comments? Seeing none. Would anyone -- oh, sorry. Go ahead, Commissioner Brodsky.

MR. BRODSKY: I also have a quick question for staff. Am I reading this correctly that with the proposed M-N use, and the R-MF to the north, and I know one of them is a PUD, but will they be required to do a Level 2 screening along that entire northern edge?

MR. KUNZ: I believe it -- that's a good question. I think it's Level 3, if it is connected to a multi-family residential uses.

MR. BRODSKY: Okay.

MR. KUNZ: So I believe it would be Level 3.

MR. BRODSKY: Okay. So is that considered --

MR. KUNZ: What was that? Sorry.

MR. BRODSKY: Is that considered -- M-N is not considered mixed use?

MR. CRAIG: With the applicant use, I don't think it necessarily says mixed-use. I think it is just, like, residential commercial industrial maybe, if I'm remembering correctly. And the applicant's use, it ultimately would up -- depend on what's developed. Because if there's no residential component to it, then it wouldn't be mixed use.

MR. BRODSKY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If I may, Commissioner Brodsky, there's a difference between the zoning classification, named mixed use, and an actual mixed use of the property, so that -- it has to be the actual use before the screening changes. Any further questions or comments, rather, from Commissioners? Would anyone like to make a motion? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Yeah. Regarding Case Number 135-2026, I would -- I would make a motion to approve the request to rezone the 3.15 acre site from R-MF, to M-N.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Walters, seconded by Commissioner Gray. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Walters,

Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Geuea Jones, Dr. Gray, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton? The motion carries 6-0.

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Commissioner Darr, if you can hear me, please return. And at this time, I would like to excuse Commissioner Stanton for personal reasons for the rest of the evening. Thank you. Moving on back up the agenda to our next case.

Case Number 91-2026

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of PB and CJ Properties, LLC (owners), for approval to rezone 3.5-acres from Planned Development (PD) to Planned

Development (PD), and approve a PD development plan and an associated Statement of Intent. Approval would permit 34 multi-family units, and two two-family units to be known as "Bay Hills PD" to be constructed. The subject site is located northwest of the intersection of Richland Road and Grace Lane and is addressed as 3 and 21 Grace Lane.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Ross Halligan of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the request to rezone the 3.50-acres from Planned Development to Planned Development, as well as the PD Plan for "Bay Hills PD", serving as the site's preliminary plat, and the associated Statement of Intent subject to:

1. Technical corrections

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

MR. BRODSKY: A couple of questions. So I'm looking at the original PUD plan, and it looks to me like they -- yeah, there we go. So they build the -- the three units on the north side of the parcel, and then it looks like they went ahead and combined those two smaller buildings --

MR. HALLIGAN: Correct.

MR. BRODSKY: -- on the south side, just built that one large building?

MR. HALLIGAN: Correct. Yes.

MR. BRODSKY: So the -- in the red, what we're left with was originally going to be three units, and they're now just showing two units on that part. Correct?

MR. HALLIGAN: Yes.

MR. BRODSKY: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I had that right, so even though we've kind of got this issue with the two access points, that we're not increasing density above -- above and beyond what was already approved. And my second question, and Mr. Zenner, this might be more for you. I'm not looking to assign blame, but just how does this happen? How does that PUD get built and -- and that driveway doesn't get built per Code?

MR. ZENNER: I mean, the developer chooses when to make improvements to the project site, and this particular development -- so the property was subdivided. It was still left according to the PD plan. Well, you subdivide property, and the new property owner buys the subdivided portion, decides he doesn't want to follow the plan. We don't control the timing of development. The development, the extension that would have gone through the newly created lot would have been required at the time that that building were built, and so the builder, the new owner chose not to build on that lot. I believe Mr. Crockett representing the applicant today can explain some of the efforts that were made in order to try to work with the condominium association. Again, as the fire services pointed out in the communication with Mr. Halligan, the installation of a fire compliant turnaround, what would be, ostensibly, a T, is possible, but that would be a private matter for our fire service if they really feel that it's necessary. Given that there has not been any connection point here for years, probably close to a decade, is it warranted and do they really want to force that issue? At this point, we can't force a new owner to connect into a property that they're not willing to participate in. It would be, in essence, creating a private access into a private driveway situation. And so it's just a course of events, not really controlled by staff, because we would have facilitated the original PD plan if they wanted to build that three-unit building. And the only way they would have been to have built that three-unit building, given the frontage that is left on Pebble Beach Drive, is they would have had to have likely fronted it along the driveway that wasn't constructed. Instead, they chose not to, and we reduced the total impact of one dwelling unit to be able

to front onto the existing public street, thereby saving some additional infrastructure costs, but really not necessarily at what the fire service believes to be a significant detriment because other options do exist to resolve the fire access.

MR. BRODSKY: And that makes sense, you know. We permit hundreds, if not thousands, of developments and construction sites every year in Columbia. So, you know, that we had one slip through isn't the end of the world or this shocking thing. But I more just wanted to discuss this and get this on the record for Council to see this, so that, you know, we might need to look at what kind of mechanisms we have to -- to hold people's -- hold them to their intentions on the PUD plan. My opinion, all of these buildings, if they were going to build any of them, you know, they would have needed to meet fire code. A project I've been involved in, you know, that turning around a fire truck is a big deal. So to see someone through a slight of hand not be required to do that is just --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? I do have a question. I understand it is a private matter, but is the fire department saying that Lot 84A is currently non-compliant?

MR. ZENNER: They haven't come out and said that specifically.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: But they have indicated that a fire compliant turnaround could be installed. They want to pursue getting that fire compliant turnaround, given that we have property that has been sold and is being proposed to be developed by others at this time. This is just a common -- this is not an uncommon occurrence throughout the city of Columbia. And if we're wanting to move forward with development patterns and proposals that address particular broader community objectives, we have to acknowledge, at times, certain things like this do occur.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And they're not saying, though, the 84B would be noncompliant the way that it is on this PD amendment?

MR. ZENNER: Not at all. 84B has its access directly to Pebble Beach, which will be consistent with all of the fire code requirements.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So we're not creating a new noncompliance, we're just not fixing an existing noncompliance?

MR. ZENNER: Correct. And that the -- the balance of the development, which is to the south of what is 84B today, that actually is fully compliant with the through private street between St. Augustine to Grace Lane. The access to Grace Lane actually was adjusted from the original plan submission, to be aligned further to the north from the intersection to ensure that it actually provides a greater separation from the future roundabout. The original plan also had shown a right-in/right-out only, which this plan was originally entitled to along Richland Road. At the recommendation of staff as it looked at this project in initial design, we were able to work with the applicant to have them remove that right-in/right-out, as well, further reducing conflicts along Richland Road entering and exiting the roundabout.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I appreciate that, because that -- that's been an issue. I notice there's a stub up near where there's the connection with the place road -- Grace Lane -- Grace Lane.

MR. ZENNER: That actually -- the stub -- what appears to be the stub, so where the curve is, I believe that's --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Am I just blind?

MR. ZENNER: -- that's parking.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's parking.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. So that answers my other question, which was -- my other question was, is this PD plan laid out in such a way that if the condominium complex in 84A sees the light, they could do a --

MR. ZENNER: I would imagine it is possible. We would have to look at what the parking -- if there is parking coverage, because we need to have a guest parking that needs to be provided based on the multi-family nature of this. It may be very tight. However, I think authorizing an amendment of that nature, given the added value, is something that we probably could easily get behind. In order to do that type of connection, however, would require coordination between two likely future entities.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. No. I absolutely understand that. I just think if we have an opportunity to leave that door open, it seems prudent.

MR. ZENNER: I do not disagree. My original review of Mr. Halligan's report actually was going to make a statement that the new road alignment actually provided access, and I then I looked at the plan again, and I said, oh, no, it doesn't.

MS. GEUEA JONES: No.

MR. ZENNER: It's actually just parking spaces that are in a green space, but it does -- as you have identified, there would be an opportunity. And I think it's really we're only looking at probably a 20-foot driveway connection that would be needed to ensure fire access is met.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would that be a difficult amendment for us to make tonight from the dais to say that they may reduce it by three spots or however many are there if it provides that connection?

MR. ZENNER: I think that could be -- it could be made. It is a -- it's a forward-thinking amendment that would allow us latitude for a minor adjustment at that point to the plan. I think it probably would be worthwhile, just in case an opportunity does arise. It would definitely allow us that ability then to streamline the modification of the existing PD plan here for Bay Hills.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Yeah. I would like just -- unless somebody thinks that's a terrible idea, what would it basically do is say that the parking may be reduced -- further reduced by three spots in that location if it provides -- for the purposes of providing a connection to Lot 84A. Does that make sense, what I'm saying? Yeah.

MR. CRAIG: Are you suggesting a note and then -- on the PD, et cetera. Did you want -- I'm just confused as to what precisely you're requesting, that they actually be removed, or a note be added that the --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think just a note to say that at -- at the applicant developer's choice, if those three spots are reduced, it doesn't get them out of compliance somehow with the PD SOI.

MR. ZENNER: You would, in essence, be approving a three-space parking exception to the minimum requirements --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: -- for the purposes of ensuring that fire access to Lot 84A is met.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unless Planner Halligan knows -- off the top of your head, do they need those three spots to be compliant?

MR. HALLIGAN: No. I believe there's 92 currently on site, if I recall correctly.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. So it may not be necessary because --

MR. HALLIGAN: I believe there's a little buffer there. Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Can you verify that before we vote?

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Crockett may be able to answer that for you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, excellent. Mr. Crockett, now you know what we're going to ask you. Any other questions for staff? I'm sorry. I know that's a little premature as we're not in Commissioner comment, but I wanted to give staff some time to contemplate. Okay. In that case, we will close Commissioner comment, and go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Public comment on this case, please come forward.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, offices at 1000 West Nifong. Let me start out just a little bit before my presentation, to answer your question, Mr. Brodsky, with regards to 84, I know this is not pertinent necessarily to this specific PD plan, but when 84A was developed, it was developed under prior to the current fire code that we have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you give us -- are we good with the -- okay. Go ahead. Sorry, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. So it was -- it was developed prior to the previous code, and how that developed was while those look like eight-unit apartment buildings, they're actually condos. So the developer who built those, he built them one building at a time and sold units as he went along, so built enough units in this building, built the next building. So it went over time, and he was in full compliance with the fire code at the time, but then the fire code changed when we adopted Appendix D, and we had, you know, the turnarounds, and the number of units and all of that. So really, I don't think it was something -- you -- you asked how can we avoid this in the future? How can -- what can staff do? I don't think staff did anything wrong. I think they enforced the code that was in front of them at the time, and then the code changed, and then we have the situation that may not comply today. And so I think that's where that came from. So just to kind of answer that. And with regards to the -- to the parking spaces, Madam Chair, I believe we were pretty close to the minimum number that we -- that we need on the site. However, staff looks at this while we're -- the proposal that's before you, what we are looking at doing is doing attached single family, basically, town homes. Staff looks at that, given that they're all one lot, as multi-family residential. So we believe that there's ample spaces on the site. And so if we had to lose those three, I think we're okay with that. So if we looked at it on a single-family attached, we wouldn't need quite so many, so I think we would be okay with that. So with that being said --

MR. ZENNER: You're not going to -- you're not going to get it, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. I'm not going to get it. So I'm going to forego my presentation tonight. I'm happy to answer any questions. The one item I would like to say, Mr. Halligan, in the staff report, it says that sewer is not available to the site, but actually it does come across the property. So I just want to make sure that, just for clarification purposes. And one of the slides that I did prepare tonight, I wish I could show, really kind of illustrates the different areas -- the different -- the characteristics of this area, the different types of housing in this area. And so when we look at the housing study, and it talks about having diverse housing options in different types, I think this is a prime example of that very thing. We have Bay Hills and we have Eastport that are single family. We have the new multi-family residential that this Commission approved a month or two ago. It's higher density multi-family. We have condos right just to the north of us that are single-family condos, and we have duplexes that are further to the east. And so now we want to do single-family attached, which is a different type of unit mix. And so within a thousand feet, this whole area is a wide range of residential uses. And so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions, given that my presentation is not going to work tonight. So I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Apologies for the technical difficulties.

MR. CROCKETT: That's okay. No worries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for Mr. Crockett? If not, I'll ask mine. Okay. Do you want us to put a note on the plan that says you can lose them just in case?

MR. CROCKETT: Oh, we -- that would be fine. That would be fine.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that you don't get in a spot --

MR. CROCKETT: Sure. Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- when the time comes for final approvals to break ground.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. When we originally -- we reached out to the HOA, originally, because we had believed that that was probably the best avenue was to make that connection. We were able to gain a unit, flip our units around, have parking come in -- come to that. They weren't interested, and we need that because the parking stops on their private properties, so we can't just go get it. It's not at the property line. We need to -- we need to construct that -- that entrance onto their property. There we go, maybe.

MR. ZENNER: That's ours.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. And so -- so we're happy. I mean, we would be -- you know, if we could put a note on there that says if that connection is made, then those three spaces could go away, we would be appreciative of that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Then -- very good. Thank you. I think that's everything I need. Anyone else? Seeing none. Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward. Seeing none. We will close public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comment. So just -- I don't want to belabor it, but -- but what I am suggesting is just making sure the option is there should they be able to work out an agreement with the other HOA. Commissioner Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: But in what format? I mean, what -- is that a note that we're supposed to --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MR. WALTERS: And part of a motion would include that note?

MS. GEUEA JONES: I believe so.

MR. CRAIG: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Or --

MR. CRAIG: Or you can take a vote on whether the Commissioner wants to add the note, and then on the -- on the PD itself or --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Why don't we do that, so that it's clear for the record that we'll take

one vote on adding the note about the parking spaces and the connection. We'll take another vote on the final approval, and then you all can update the plan as you see fit. Does that work? Or not as you see fit, but in line with that if it gets --

MR. CRAIG: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- because we already have technical corrections, is what I'm thinking.

MR. CRAIG: I think that's fine.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Very good. Commissioner Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: We could say something regarding -- when we're making the motion, subject to technical corrections, including a possible reduction of three parking units in the future.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We'll actually make two motions.

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: One motion --

MR. WALTERS: So they're going to be separate?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Yeah. Two motions, two votes.

MR. WALTERS: Which is first?

MS. GEUEA JONES: We'll do the parking first. I'll make the motion on parking.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. Which I try not to do, but sometimes when they're complicated, I don't mind. Okay. Any further Commissioner comment on this case? Seeing none. I will make a motion to include a note on the PD plan that says that the three parking spaces located near the connection with Grace Lane may be removed if it facilitates a connection to the condominium complex to the northwest.

MR. WALTERS: Via Pebble Ridge?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Via Pebble Ridge?

MR. ZENNER: I would refer to it as Lot 84A.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Ah. The connection to Lot 84A.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We have a motion by Chairperson Geuea Jones, and a second by Commissioner Gray. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, when you're ready, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Darr, Ms. Geuea Jones, Dr. Gray, Ms. Ortiz. The motion carries 6-0.

MR. BRODSKY: Motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. And moving on to approval, would someone like to make a motion on approval? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Yes. Regarding Case Number 91-2026, I would make a motion to approve the request to rezone the 3.5 acres from planned development to planned development, as well as the PD plan for Bay Hills PD, and the associated Statement of Intent, subject to technical corrections.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Walters, seconded by Commissioner Gray. Is there any discussion on that motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote: (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Darr, Ms. Geuea Jones, Dr. Gray, Ms. Ortiz. The Motion carries 6-0.

MR. BRODSKY: Motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Those recommendations will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to our next case.

Case Number 136-2026

A request by Donna Grathwohl (agent), on behalf of GPD Development LLC (owner), to allow the property addressed as 503 West Stewart Road to operate a 210-night, maximum four-guest short-term rental pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and Sec. 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The unit sought for licensure is located within the second story of a stacked duplex structure, and there is sufficient parking on-site. The 0.31-acre subject property is located 80 feet east of the intersection of Westwood Avenue and West Stewart Road.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Ross Halligan of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit to allow the dwelling at 503 West Stewart Road to be operated as a STR subject to:

1. The maximum occupancy of four transient guests;
2. A maximum of 210 nights of annual rental usage.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with parties to this case outside of the public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Questions for staff? You may know, and if not, I will ask the applicant. This is a duplex. Is the other unit going to be licensed as a long term rental or both?

MR. HALLIGAN: Yes. It has a long -- well, the property, itself, has a long-term rental license that is through, I believe, September of 2026 -- of this year.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It's --

MR. HALLIGAN: It has been licensed as a two-family long-term rental since 2020 with a different owner, so it's had continued use as a two-family long-term rental since 2020.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So does it have two long-term rental licenses?

MR. ZENNER: The license would be for a single structure with two dwelling units.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. Okay

MR. HALLIGAN: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: So it's same way -- the same way of saying it is it has two long-term rental licenses --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: -- but the way in Neighborhood Services, it's one structure with two units.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any members of the public are here to speak on this case, please come forward. State your name and address for the record, please.

MR. GRUBER: My name is Ken Gruber; I live at 500 West Stewart Road, right across the street. I've read your agenda report, and I've got a collaborative observation. I think that's the way. There's a question in my mind, Paragraph 2 under discussion, it implies this has already been serving as a short-term rental based upon staff observations and Airbnb. Does that mean it was being used -- income was used -- gained by this short-term rental without going through the proper certificate of compliance, business license, City Council action? Is that the -- is that -- am I on the right track?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, Mr. Gruber. It was. It was cited as a violation in September of 2025. And our research of the Airbnb records and the reviews would verify that as a part of a licensure process. Obtaining a business license now, the applicant will be required to back pay all rental receipts due to the City for accommodation taxes from June 1st of 2025. So they would be required to reimburse the City for all illegal revenue received at 5 percent per rental night, and that is -- that is a condition of the business license issuance. And so while there was a delay in compliance, the applicant has finally come forward, and our -- in our processes of dealing with gaining compliance out of our illegal operators is an ongoing effort. So we -- we do the best that we can with the staff and the resources we have. This took a little bit longer, but they are now before us. So if they are approved, which is not a guarantee, as part of their licensure process to obtain a legal license, they will be required to pay the back accommodation taxes that are due to the City of Columbia.

MR. GRUBER: I would make one grammatical change to what you just said in your sentence. Delay should be taken away and failure should be used.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you very much, sir.

MR. GRUBER: So according to, I believe, City ordinances, that applicant qualified to have their long-term license revoked by their failure to get the short-term license.

MR. ZENNER: The long-term rental licensing penalties and the short-term rental licensing penalties are two totally separate sections of our rental conservation law. The mere fact that they were operating an illegal short-term rental does not one's long-term rental certificate.

MR. GRUBER: If you -- I'm a scientist entrepreneur, and we do experiments in science with controls. If you want to see what Stewart Road West could look like, go to the block East Stewart Road, and go to the north side, look at the north side of the block, and see whether those houses, which are short-term rentals to students, multiple students in the houses. See whether those houses are maintained the way West Stewart Road is maintained. You've already done the experiment. But I'm really confused about you talking about developing what appears to be Old Southwest, the whole of the -- the larger Old Southwest, not the true beginning Old Southwest where my house is. If you look at a breakdown of Old Southwest, there is an Old Southwest very small area that is our block, which is probably one of the older blocks because some of us still have the land in back of the house for the horses. But I don't understand when you're talking about commercial development Old Southwest. Old Southwest, the larger area, has been single-family houses built from farmland for over 100 years. And

now we're talking about doing commercial development in Old Southwest because of adjacent. Well, Old Southwest is adjacent to downtown Columbia. I don't understand what you're talking about. Is there a plan to develop Stewart Road, Old Southwest, with commercial, right in here in your report.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please continue your comments, sir. Did you -- I'm sorry. Did you have more.

MR. GRUBER: I think that Old Southwest is doing fine in terms of its high tax rate for the City. If you can make it into East Stewart Road, you're going to see a lot of difference in the tax income from land in Old -- the Old Southwest.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Walters? Excuse me. Sir --

MR. WALTERS: Mr. Gruber.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Gruber, could you please -- Commissioner Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: Well, could you specify where in the report you're referencing about -- your concern about future development? Just tell us where you are.

MR. GRUBER: Okay. The goal of creating livable and sustainable neighborhoods, approval of the -- mixed-use concepts.

MR. WALTERS: Are you in Section B?

MR. GRUBER: No. I'm sorry. Under conditional use analysis, Section B, second paragraph.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. All right. Okay. Great.

MR. GRUBER: Talking back, you know, commercial use, community-wide service for supplemental housing for visitors. I did a -- a Chat GPT analysis, it's -- there's plenty of short-term hotels, motels. Go down New 63. They are being built along it. No shortage. They bought a hospital -- a tertiary care hospital is here. You've got rows of hotels.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anything further, Mr. -- Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Well, I'm not -- I'm probably not as well-versed in explaining this further, but just because it's referenced that this is a type of usage, no -- no -- as far as I know, no, there is no broad, comprehensive planning for further intensive sort of commercial usage that I think you're fearful of. I don't think that's implied.

MR. GRUBER: Is this the first STR for Old Southwest?

MS. GEUEA JONES: No, sir.

MR. WALTERS: No.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions? Seeing none. Thank you for being here. Next speaker on this case, please come forward.

MS. ZIA: Roseanna Zia, 403 South Glenwood Avenue.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry. Could you do that again, a little closer to the microphone?

MS. ZIA: Roseanna Zia, 403 South Glenwood Avenue.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MS. ZIA: So I live within one block of this property, and I oppose this conditional use permit. The heart of Columbia's short-term rental ordinance is neighborhood preservation. Columbia chose not to let high-frequency, non-primary residents short term rentals into residential districts automatically because that kind of use can gradually convert stable neighborhoods into commercial lodging areas. The conditional use permit requirement is our only safeguard. It requires that applicants prove that this 210-night short-term rental not erode the residential character of this residential block. So this is a burden of proof that must be taken upon by the applicants. This cannot just be a matter of filing paperwork. They must prove that the neighborhood that they propose to commercialize is consistent with commercialization. Gradual conversion of homes into commercial rentals in this neighborhood are already occurring, and it should be stopped, in my opinion. That's what this law was passed to protect us from. So this is not an owner-occupied home-sharing situation. The applicant is an LLC. The property is not the registrant's primary residence, and the public record indicates that the commercial applicant operates multiple short-term rentals in Columbia. Does a 210-night commercial lodging use belong in this family R-1 neighborhood, especially where the applicant has already operated this property as an Airbnb without approval? I say no, this is not a resident occasionally sharing their own home. Approval would expand an LLC operated short-term lodging model into another established residential block. And, in fact, they have purchased this home with the intent to use it in this way without getting approval for this, purchased from realtors advertising widely, oh, just buy a home in the Old Southwest, you can convert them to Airbnbs. It's great for game weekends. Further, City staff acknowledged that the LLC requests 33 percent more people occupancy than allowed in a long-term rental, with almost daily turnover when you do the arithmetic. This is fundamentally and substantively different from a family, an owner occupant, or a long-term tenant. It brings repeated guest turnover, unfamiliar vehicles, and arrivals and departures, and no connection to our neighborhood. The conditional use process should protect us against that. If the City approved each 210-night request, first, this one, then another one, and then another, then it's just going to -- this is exactly the type of gradual conversion the ordinance was meant to prevent. So we voted for this protection, and I ask you to use it. The application also has serious credibility problems. It was partially unfilled out, the application's form says a dwelling has not previously been used as an Airbnb, but as stated by staff, it has active on-line activity showing that it was operating and has been penalized for operating as such, undermining confidence in any assertions they make in caring about the neighborhood. Staff also answers that as the STR previously offered with yes, and identifies a prior illegal short-term rental dated September 26, 2025. Further, the answers provided by the applicants on the required forms are also inadequate. If you've looked at their responses, they answered I don't know about STRs, I don't know about neighborhood support, and simply no when asked whether the short-term rental would increase traffic or noise, which, of course, it will. These are not meaningful answers for a discretionary permit in a residential neighborhood. And this is a serious matter, and so it should have been taken seriously when they answered these questions. There is also inconsistency about parking. The application says there are two on-site driveway parking areas, while staff describes six, and then there's a two-car garage, and there's no street parking immediately, and this neighborhood is already traveled by people parking sort of indiscriminately in front of other people's homes without parking permits. This serves any identified -- and the record should clearly identify which space is served the -- a short-term rental if parking is part of the justification for approval. I respect the one letter of support from the next door neighbor. I did not write the opposing letters. This is a third opinion I offer you. But one supportive letter does not cure an inaccurate application, a prior illegal violation, conclusory and cursory answers and unresolved parking questions. Overall, the applicant has not shown this is 210-night transient lodging use is compatible with this residential neighborhood, or that it will not cause adverse impacts. That is their burden to show, and they have not shown that. They have even barely addressed that. I ask you to recommend denial, and to take this seriously, and to not just rubber stamp this approval.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there questions for -- Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: You said that the LLC operates multiple Airbnbs. Where did you get that information? Okay. Can you explain?

MS ZIA: Well, I looked up who the owners were, who the representatives were, and I looked up

what other properties they operate, and there are at least other -- two properties are noted in town.

MS. ORTIZ: And on Airbnb, or just generally, like, rentals?

MS. ZIA: From both, from what I found.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. That information would be, like, really relevant to us, so if you had, like, anything more that we could, like, look into, that would have been really helpful.

MS. ZIA: And I can provide it to you or send you an e-mail with the links, if you would like, and it's easy to --

MS. ORTIZ: You can send it to staff. Thank you.

MS. ZIA: It's easy to find through a search.

MS GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Seeing none. Thank you for being here. Next speaker on this case, please come forward.

MR. ZEMKE: My name is John Zemke; I live at 513 Westwood. I'm an owner/resident for the past 25 years. With regard to the staff -- well, in the first place, I am very much opposed to allowing this conditional use. The neighborhood's character is clearly residential, long-term residential. There are rental properties, but there are many owners. I am somewhat concerned about the reference in the general review, Item B, and the heading is the proposed conditional use is consistent with the City's adoptive Comprehensive Plan. And the first sentence is, "The Comprehensive Plan does not speak directly to the use of residential dwellings for alternative purposes, such as an STR." So it must be disqualified if the Comprehensive Plan does not speak to this use. I'm also concerned about Item C -- or, excuse me. I will return to Item B, Paragraph 2, second sentence: This strategy focuses on the concept of creating nodes of commercial and service uses as high priority, and the action recommends using planning tools and decision making to locate services and businesses adjacent to residential development. Adjacent means lying next to, not directly within. This property lies directly within. I am somewhat confused by the language in Paragraph C. The CUP in the staff -- CUP uses in compliance with the area. This is clearly not the case. The area is zoned R-1, and it's developed as single-family dwellings. I did request from staff identification of the number of rental units within a four-block area on Monday by e-mail. I have not yet received a response. Item D allows the staff allows that it does not foresee the future, but it doesn't anticipate that there will be an increase of nuisance to the residents of the neighborhood. I once lived for a period of nine years on East Campus, and I'm quite familiar with the nuisance rate that rentals can generate, whether they're short-term or long-term. West Campus doesn't really have a problem with long-term rental in instances at this point. Finally, Item F. I think we should remember that if the request is for the second floor of the home, and the Airbnb advertisements allow for the entire use of the home, we're not being given a straightforward account of the intention. So in closing, where I articulate as a speaker, I would say I oppose this, and I think it's your responsibility to oppose it, as well. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you. Anyone else here to speak on this case tonight, please come forward. Sir, you can come up to the front row so you're -- go ahead.

MR. SLINKARD: Hi. My name is Paul Slinkard; I live at 603 Edgewood Avenue, which is kind of catty-corner from the block that you show on the map. I've been a resident of Columbia and in that home for seven years, and a proud resident in Columbia. Moved to Old Southwest because of the character of the neighborhood, the beauty of the homes, and the single-family homes. I have no evidence to prove this, but I would assume that that house was built as a single-family home, just like all the other homes in the neighborhood, and that at some point in time converted to a duplex. It's not in character with our neighborhood. In looking at another aspect, the parking issue, for example, if you look at Google Street View, I just looked it up on my phone, if the people in the -- that -- that occupy the home now, if they have -- if they're a two-car family, which most people are, we're a four-car family. You know

we have two kids with cars. And so if you put their cars and then all of a sudden you have, you know, two other couples coming in from out of town with their cars, you can't get all those cars, you can't get all those cars in that area without double parking. So you're going to have people parking on Westwood, which you can park on the street. So I think this is just totally unacceptable for our neighborhood. I think it's a money grab for the people that own the property, and I ask you to not to approve this. Thank you.

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

DR. GRAY: Hi.

MR. SLINKARD: Oh, I'm sorry.

DR. GRAY: Question. Sorry. You said you live on Westwood or Edgewood?

MR SLINKARD: Edgewood.

DR. GRAY: Okay.

MR. SLINKARD: It's the corner of Edgewood and Lathrop.

DR. GRAY: Okay. And when you were aware that this operating as an STR prior to notification from this hearing?

MR. SLINKARD: I'm sorry. I don't have any idea what that means.

DR. GRAY: Did you know that it was an STR before you got a postcard in the mail?

MR, SLINKARD: No.

DR. GRAY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SLINKARD: The wife did.

DR. GRAY: The wife did. Got it. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case? Thank you.

MR. JONES: My name is Douglas Jones; we live at 601 South Glenwood, just around the corner from this home. I came tonight with an open mind. I really wanted to hear what people had to say. And the thing that, as I listen to what people have to say, I just really want to stand in support of the neighbors who live closer to the home that I do that are in opposition to it. I try to put myself in their shoes. If they had this situation next door to myself, I would hope that they would lend their voice, as well. I do have some concerns about the nature of the neighborhood. I was on the Historic Preservation Commission for a few years, and really appreciate the neighborhood that we have and the character that it has. And I think what the City has done in terms of limiting the number of days for short-term rentals is appropriate, and I would like that what has been established as far as the ordinances now would be the ones that are continued to be followed for this particular property. Thank you.

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

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: (Inaudible.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. I'm sorry. We only do one per. Hello. Name and address for the record, please.

MS. GRATHWOHL: My name is Donna Grathwohl; I own the house at 503 Stewart. I bought the house in the fall. We knew the person that lived in the house prior, and I liked the idea of being able to run an Airbnb or a 30-day rental because I had done it in my past when my husband and I developed Arbor Falls out in Hawthorn. We eventually sold that whole property and sold the Airbnb I ran, which broke my heart, because it gave me pride and joy to do it. I love taking care of the house. I love the positive comments. I love making sure everything is wonderful for them. That property, Stewart Road, in general, my brother and sister-in-law lived on Stewart Road for years in a big, gray house that's even gotten bigger. I love Stewart, I love Columbia. I've lived there 45 years. My husband, before he passed, lived here 66 years. I'm trying to slowly improve it, and it does look a lot better than it looked when I bought it with the purple porch. It is now black. I'm getting ready to put in landscaping. It's just something that I honestly look forward to doing because since he passed three years ago, it gives me a purpose again, and I enjoy having a reason to get out of the house and go take care of something else, and keep track of things. I own other properties, and no, I don't have another Airbnb. I have a 30-day rental, and I rent two other properties. I have no other Airbnbs. If it's listed on the Airbnb, it's for a 30-day or more. I just want to say I went into it not knowing there were so many rules. And then when I was made aware, it took me a while to figure out the paperwork and the paperwork that was referred to. I even had to pass it on to my accountant, because I was so confused on what they wanted and what answers I was supposed to put in there. So nothing was trying to be deceptive. I was trying to state what I could by doing this on my own, because prior, it was my husband and I doing these things, so I haven't tried to be deceptive in any way. I get a lot of joy and pleasure out of it. I appreciate Stewart. I love Columbia. I screen every guest that comes my house. The only people that come are on Friday and Saturday nights. The rest of the time the house is empty. Ninety-eight percent of anybody that's ever come to the house, it's generally a parent of a student coming for a graduation, coming for a football game, coming for a parents' weekend, coming to a wrestling match, coming to a swimming match. I don't allow young people to come and party. I have very specific rules, and there is ample parking for the amount of people that can stay there. Any questions? I'm kind of shaking up here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Good. We're not as mean as we look. It's the dais that makes us so mean.

MS. GRATHWOHL: It's just me. I don't -- I don't do at a think, you know, like this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You're doing just fine. Any questions? Commissioner Gray, go ahead.

DR. GRAY: She lied. I'm as mean as I look. No. Thank you so much for this information. So just to clarify, you -- when did you buy this property, roughly?

MS. GRATHWOHL: Mid '25.

DR. GRAY: Okay. And --

MS GRATHWOHL: I had to buy a lot of furniture, stock it --

DR. GRAY: Sure.

MS. GRATHWOHL: -- and start from there.

DR. GRAY: And you said previously you had operated short-term rentals?

MS GRATHWOHL: No. I had had -- I had had an Air -- well, it wasn't Airbnb at that time. It was ten years ago, a HomeAway, and it was out in Hawthorn, and then we wound up selling that. Since then, I haven't done an Airbnb. I do have a property that I do a 30 -- usually, people come for three months at a time. It's mostly nursing students. Other than that, I have no other Airbnbs, but I do have two other rental houses that are, like, yearly rentals that I have.

DR. GRAY: Got it. Thank you so much. And so you received the notice of a violation back in September. Was that the first time that you became aware of the regulations?

MS. GRATHWOHL: (No audible response.)

DR. GRAY: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry, ma'am. Could you say yes out loud for the transcript?

MS. GRATHWOHL: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes. I was clueless on all of that, it took me a long time to figure out how to fill out the paperwork. And that's when I finally went to my accountant to have them try to help me, because, no, I had no idea because the girl that had had it prior, yeah, I had people in. We did -- I'm, like, great, that's what I want to do. So I jumped in and started doing it.

DR. GRAY: So since that violation and submitting your application, have you continued to operate as a short-term rental?

MS. GRATHWOHL: I will be honest. In May, I had people that had reached out to me a year ago when they found out when graduation was, and they committed a year ago to me for graduation, and I had a hard time refusing them to -- when they were flying in for their kid's graduation. Yes. There have been people there for graduation.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Commissioner Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: I have a couple of quick questions. Do you have video cameras in front or back of the house to monitor your parking?

MS. GRATHWOHL: No. But honestly, we were getting ready to do that, because I'm allowed to be able to put them, like, on the driveway or the front porch.

MR. WALTERS: Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

MS. GRATHWOHL: I mean, I would be happy.

MR. WALTERS: No, that's fine. I just -- you know, I had a follow-up question, but I forgot it, so I'll come back if we need -- if there's time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: And I don't mean to put you on the spot, and definitely don't -- I'm not trying to beat you up here, but you received the notice of violation in September. And just based off the reviews on Airbnb, it looks like you've had quite a few people staying over the last several months, and been renting out both the top and the bottom on Airbnb.

MS. GRATHWOHL: (No audible response.)

MR. BRODSKY: Yeah. If you wouldn't mind just saying yes.

MS. GRATHWOHL: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes.

MR. BRODSKY: Yeah. No, you're okay. Okay. Yeah. I think that's all I have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? So I -- I had a couple. So the previous owner was operating it as a short-term rental?

MS. GRATHWOHL: (No audible response.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: And you bought it -- you bought it back in the summer?

MS. GRATHWOHL: I honestly can't tell the specific date, but --

MS. GEUEA JONES: You don't have to tell us the date, I'm just trying to get a general sense of how many months.

MS. GRATHWOHL: Yeah. I think it was four or five months prior to me ever starting anything because it came completely empty, so I had to -- I had to totally fill it with furnishings and kitchen items, and the whole nine yards to be able to do it like that. So it took me several months to get that accomplished.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So do you think you have owned it for nine or ten months? Does that seem right?

MS. GRATHWOHL: Probably. I mean, I could let you know for sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. I'm just --

MS. GRATHWOHL: Yeah. I can't tell you 100 percent. I would say, yes, that's probably accurate.

MS. GEUEA JONES: How many rental nights do you think you've had? Have you looked at that since you've owned it?

MS. GRATHWOHL: I could let you know that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, the reason that I'm asking --

MS. GRATHWOHL: It not, like -- it has not been every single weekend, and it's never been during a week.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MS. GRATHWOHL: It's always on a weekend. But, I mean, once I kind of changed my prices a little bit --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

MS. GRATHWOHL: -- all of a sudden, I started getting more people wanting to come and stay, because I -- I specifically was looking in my prices for the football games, and I had set them a little higher, and then after football and winter came, it's, like, okay, I think my -- I lowered them, but --

MS. GEUEA JONES: So --

MS. GRATHWOHL: -- I wasn't have as good a response, so I lowered them again, and then it picked back up again.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here is my concern, and why -- why I'm asking. In your application, you said this had not previously been operated as an STR.

MS. GRATHWOHL: By me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But that's also not true, because you just said you had been operating it as an STR since you bought it.

MS. GRATHWOHL: Prior to me, you said.

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. In the application, it said has this property been previously operated as an STR, and you said no. And I'm trying to figure out what your thinking was in saying no to that

question.

MS. GRATHWOHL: I don't know. I had help with my accountant to fill all of it out. She helped me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Did your accountant think that you weren't operating it?

MS. GRATHWOHL: I mean, she knew exactly what my intentions were and what was going on.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MS. GRATHWOHL: I didn't -- I didn't even understand all that terminology. That's why I had to go to her.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure. So let me -- let me --

MS. GRATHWOHL: Maybe I'm misunderstanding what you're asking.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, that's -- that's what I am concerned about. So the question on the application says whether or -- oh, let's see. Here we go. Whether the proposed registrant has previously operated an STR, and if such operation has resulted in a history of complaints. So that's two questions, and maybe that's where the confusion is.

MS. GRATHWOHL: And history of complaints?

MS. GEUEA JONES: What -- there are two questions. Right? Whether you have previously operated an STR. And then, if so, whether you have had any complaints, been denied a certificate, or had one revoked. So do you operate, and has there been an issue? And the registrant, which would be you --

MS. GRATHWOHL: Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- answered no to this question.

MS. GRATHWOHL: Because it was -- well, I mean, the way I'm understanding what you just said, have you ever previously? No, I hadn't, except -- I mean, I didn't look at the ten years ago. I did that, and I didn't know it was called that. It was through a totally different company. I thought you were asking prior to owning this property. I didn't know you were specifically talking about this property, I think is maybe where I was confused -- or they were confused.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you didn't review this before you signed it?

MS. GRATHWOHL: I did, but I counted on Jodi Bales, my accountant, who was helping me fill the whole thing out to make sure I did it right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And do you still live here in town?

MS. GRATHWOHL: (No audible response.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Were you --

MR. CRAIG: Can we get that answer again? Just for the transcript?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, I'm sorry. Did you say yes?

MS. GRATHWOHL: Yes.

MR. CRAIG: Yeah. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: When you brought this property, you knew it had been operating as a short-term rental?

MS. GRATHWOHL: Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And you were not aware that you needed to get a license, and this was last summer?

MS. GRATHWOHL: (No audible response.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Could you say it out loud?

MS. GRATHWOHL: I'm sorry. Yes. I -- no. I did not know I needed to do anything. She didn't inform me. I was not aware. I had no idea.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But you were aware that it was being operated as a short-term rental?

MS. GRATHWOHL: By Julia, yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MS. ORTIZ: May I --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Just one moment. Okay. I think that's -- I think that's everything that I have. Commissioner Ortiz, did you have a follow-up?

MS. ORTIZ: Yes. But it was actually just to your question. So Question 10 on the supplement application questions at the bottom of the short-term rental application, it specifically asks just one question: Has the subject dwelling, prior to this application, been used as a short-term rental, and that was answered no. And so that is the question alone isolated, and that's what I was trying to point out.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That -- that was the question I was looking for, Commissioner Ortiz.

MS. GRATHWOHL: Prior, being used by anybody, or just me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz, could you read the question to her again?

MS. ORTIZ: So the question -- it's Question 10 on the short-term rental application under the heading "supplemental application" questions. Question A, has the subject dwelling, prior to this application, been used as a short-term rental -- STR, and it's marked no.

MS. GRATHWOHL: Okay. Then I obviously presumed you were talking about myself.

MS. ORTIZ: But either way --

MS. GRATHWOHL: That's understood, but --

MS. ORTIZ: -- at the time that you filled this out, though, in November, you were already operating the short-term rental since September --

MS. GRATHWOHL: But that said prior.

MS. ORTIZ: Right. And prior it was used -- the dwelling was used by the previous owner. Correct?

MS. GRATHWOHL: Yes. To my knowledge, I guess if she was legal in what she did, I guess.

MS. ORTIZ: So I guess what I'm trying to say is that, either way, either interpretation, it's -- it's

maybe not purposefully, but it's not a true answer.

MS. GRATHWOHL: No. It wasn't purposefully.

MS. ORTIZ: Right.

MS. GRATHWOHL: Because I struggled with filling that application out. It's not an easy application for someone that doesn't really understand everything. That's why I asked for help, and why it took me a while. And I can give you Jodi Bales' name. She sat there with me and she said I have no idea. Let's put this, and I guess this is what they're asking.

MS. ORTIZ: That's all for me. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So we -- last question, Ms. Grathwohl. You're going to be the registered agent and the owner of this property. Correct?

MS. GRATHWOHL: (No audible response.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you're going to be doing all of the operation? Could you speak verbally?

MS. GRATHWOHL: Yes, I am. I do everything. I do the cleaning, I do everything.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That's all I have. Anybody else, questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight.

MS. GRATHWOHL: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there anyone else to speak in this case, please come forward.

MR. HARRISON: My name is Philip Harrison; I live at 210 Westwood, which is about five houses -- around the corner, about five houses away from the property in question. I think the question here is does an Airbnb improve the quality or diminish the quality of the neighborhood? I have lived in my location, my house for 44 years. We're very proud of our neighborhood. Counsel permitted an Airbnb across the street from us about two years ago, and I can tell you that has diminished the quality of our neighborhood. It has not improved the quality of our neighborhood. There are additional cars, quite a few, there are parties. There's loud noise on the weekends when the Airbnb is -- is rented, and we would appreciate it if you would have this maintain our neighborhood as it is. And I think it's also become apparent here that the applicant's business practices are a little bit sloppy. Thank you.

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

MR. BRODSKY: Could you repeat your address again for me?

MR HARRISON: 210 Westwood.

MR. BRODSKY: 210 Westwood. Okay. And that -- that was approved by City Council, to your knowledge?

MR. HARRISON: I assume it was. It's been in business about two years, I think.

MR BRODSKY: Yes. Do you know what the -- across the street from you, do you know what the house number is, by chance?

MR. HARRISON: 203 or 205, I think.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: I don't know -- (inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: Ma'am, if you want to come up next, you can, but I can't have you speaking from the audience. Thank you. Any follow ups, Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: No.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Well, I was going to -- hold on, just a second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sir, would be willing to send the neighborhood conservation [sic] staff, Mr. Zenner, or whoever you would like to refer him to, the short-term rental operation in your neighborhood so we can verify that they're licensed?

MR. HARRISON: Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. WALTERS: That's what I was trying to confirm. Excuse me. I was going to show a picture here to have him confirm that that would be right, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. If you could get that information, we appreciate members of the community letting us know when people are operating illegally.

MR. HARRISON: I will do that. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here. Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward.

MS. SOLIGO: My name is Shelly Soligo; I live at 603 Edgewood Avenue. And I also came tonight not intending to speak. I had came with a sadness because when I saw the sign in the yard that -- that this was yet another property that was, in fact, not always a duplex. It did happen to be a home where some friends of mine lived. Apparently, it is no longer that. And when I think of the word neighborhood, that's my neighborhood right there. And there's not one word that I heard tonight in this process about what might be now allowed in this property that makes me believe that my neighborhood will be improved by it. We have seen that it will be a person who isn't my neighbor who is just going to monetize the property. They're not going to invite somebody who could be my neighbor to live there year around, go to school with my kids, and we could get to know them. It's going to be, per their report, people who are going to come in for graduation, people who are going to come in for football games, and it's going to be whoever is going to low ball the price for that particular weekend. So that's really discouraging to me that that's what my neighborhood will be subject to. So I'm strongly asking you, please, help us protect our neighborhood and don't allow this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Anyone else? Seeing none. We'll close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments. Commissioner comments on this case. Okay. I'll start. Yeah. I -- I can't in good conscience approve a short-term rental with an owner who blatantly not answered not one, but two questions incorrectly that are pretty clear questions on this form. And whether that was unintentional misrepresentation or an accidental one doesn't really matter to me. It shows a lack of willingness to pay attention and try to follow our ordinance. I'm really uncomfortable with the fact that she said no, not once, but twice on the forms that this was not currently being operated as a short-term rental after she purchased it and was operating it through the football season as a short-term rental. So that -- that's where I'm at. I don't know where everyone else is. I will be honest that the neighborhood opposition sounds very general to me. It's not specifically about her or even the previous owner's operation. I have no doubt that they have done a lot to improve the property, but I cannot

overlook the fact that they said twice in the application process that it was not being operated as a short-term rental, knowing full well that it had been by the previous owner, and that they themselves were putting it out for rent for weekends for football. So that -- that's where I'm at. Anybody else? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I'm -- I'm struggling with this one, as well. And I'm reminded of the case -- I can't remember the gentleman's name, but we had down off of Green Meadows that I can't remember what we did. I know City Council passed it. I know I voted no on it, and that was the gentlemen that had received notice from the prosecutor's office, and was -- was still renting it out. And I also have issues with the incorrect answers on the form, but then also, you know, once you know, to still keep renting it out, and to be renting out both units, that -- I don't know. There's just -- just too many circumstances combining here that I'm probably going to be a no vote on this one.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I'll add, too, that it was a little -- I went back and I looked at the reviews, and there are some from February and April and May. So I don't know if it was a most honest representation, that it was just for graduation weekend. So I'm also uncomfortable with this. Yeah. So I will not be supporting it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: I would just agree. I'm going to vote no, for the exact reasons you guys said, not that I think this is an inappropriate location for an STR.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: I also don't plan on supporting this for the reasons that you've already stated. Again, the -- I -- the neighborhood opposition was not especially compelling to me, given that it has already operated. And it seems, as you've said, that the -- the fears were of a kind of, like, general nature, so I don't plan on supporting this, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would anyone like to make a motion? We must make all motions in the positive, so the motion maker may not necessarily even support their own motion. Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I'll make the motion. Regarding Case Number 136-2026, I would make a motion to approve the requested STR CUP subject to maximum occupancy of four transient guests, and maximum of 210 nights of annual rental usage.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Walters, seconded by Commissioner Gray. Is there any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, may we have roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting No. Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Darr, Ms. Geuea Jones, Dr. Gray, Ms. Ortiz. The motion fails 0-6.

MR. BRODSKY: The motion fails.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to our last case for the evening.

Case Number 137-2026

A request by Rachele and Jonathan Lee-Warner (owners) to allow the property addressed

as 3303 Timberhill Street to operate a 210-night, maximum four-guest short-term rental pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and Sec. 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The dwelling sought for licensure currently possesses a license allowing four guests for up to 120 nights annually. Additionally, there is adequate parking on-site. The 20.17-acre subject site is located west of the intersection of Timberhill Street and East Broadway.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Ross Halligan of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit to allow the dwelling at 3303 Timberhill street to be operated as a STR subject to:

1. The maximum occupancy of four transient guests;
2. A maximum of 210 nights of annual rental usage.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had any contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Any questions for staff? Briefly, and if the answer is no, that's okay. Do you know what our recommendation was on the original licensure? I think this is our first expansion.

MR. HALLIGAN: It was administratively approved.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It was administratively approved. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: So this is --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry. It's been a long week.

MR. ZENNER: This is the first request for an expansion of an administrative approved short-term rental.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. I'm sorry that I missed that. I'm -- that's on me. Okay. Any further questions for staff? Seeing none. Anybody to speak in this case, please come forward.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. LEE-WARNER: Jonathan Lee-Warner, 3303 Timberhill Road. Good evening, Commissioners. Thanks for hanging with me this late in the game. My wife, Rachelle, and I are the owners, and we are the occupants of 3303 Timberhill Street. Rachelle's family has owned this land, a 20-acre parcel, for four generations. When I retired from the military, we made the decision to move here and make this our home, and restore the property. It had fallen into significant disrepair over several decades, and the income from our short-term rental has been a meaningful part of what's made that possible. We've been clearing invasive trees, maintaining the land, continuing to invest in improvements, and it's allowed us to also share something very meaningful to us with visitors to the great city of Columbia. What you're considering tonight is permit for a small, attached guest space above our garage, one group at a time, mostly families visiting their children at Mizzou or other universities, or people seeking medical care. But we are onsite for every stay. We've held a 120-night license without incident or complaint. We are requesting 210 nights to build on what has been what I would call a pretty responsible operation, and we would just like to continue doing that. I also want the Commission to know that I personally visited every residence in the surrounding areas, as far as 2,000 feet away. I made contact with 11 neighbors, and left letters with those that I could with my contact information. The reception, I thought, was pretty positive across the board. We're invested in this land and this community for the long term, and we're just looking to do what we've already been doing responsibly. And I'm happy to answer any questions you guys may have.

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

for being here tonight.

MR. LEE-WARNER: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, wait. I'm sorry. I do have one quick one. How have you found it so far? Have you been getting lots of guests? Good? I'm obviously asking for more nights, I'm just --

MR LEE-WARNER: Yeah. It's been pretty good. I mean, more -- more than 120, you know, but we're not actually trying to maximize every night because it is our home. And so by that -- by that factor and it also self-selects a lot of people out that we wouldn't want in the place anyway. But it's mostly weekends, and like I said, University supported.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you for being here.

MR. LEE-WARNER: Yeah. Appreciate you guys.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other member of the public to speak on this case? Seeing none. We will close public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comment. Any Commissioner comment? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I wish all of our applications were as complete as that one.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Truly. Would you like to make a motion?

MR. WALTERS: Yes. Regarding Case Number 137-2026, I move -- I make a motion to approve the requested STR CUP subject to a maximum occupancy of four transient guests, and maximum of 210 nights of annual rental usage

DR. GRAY: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Walters; seconded by Commissioner Gray. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. May we please have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Darr, Ms. Geuea-Jones, Dr. Gray, Ms. Ortiz. The motion carries 6-0.

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. That concludes our business for the evening. We will now go to public comments.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any member of the public is here to make a comment of general nature, please come forward. Seeing none.

VII. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: We will go to staff comments, Mr. Zenner.

MR. ZENNER: So your next meeting will be on June 4th, and this begins our back-to-back meetings in the month of June. So it will be our first meeting. Our first meeting is the light one. I say light, not late. So your upcoming cases, as we were discussing before work session this evening. Subdivision request, this is actually an R-2 zoned piece of property that is being sought on June 9th to be

authorized for cottage style development standards through our Board of Adjustment for a 17-lot cottage development. This is immediately adjacent to the church at the corner of South Bethel and East Old Plank Road. The preliminary plat, of course, is the first stage in the platting process. It will have a final plat that we would not see if it is fully compliant. We have a returning case from our prior meeting on May 7th. As indicated, it is possible that this will be requested for tabling since we have not received the updated traffic study, which was the purpose for the tabling request, and this is the acreage that is just south of 2909 Rock Quarry Road immediately north of Gray Oak. And then have one short-term rental request in an R-2 zoned area, and is half of a duplex at 1804 Juniper. These are the locations of your upcoming projects. Two of them should appear to be -- well, one of them is familiar, and the other two should be new to some. Tonight, there's a couple of announcements that I will make. One, it is with great appreciation for Ms. Ortiz's service. This is Ms. Ortiz's last meeting this evening. Congratulations on a new adventure to start in your life. We will miss you. Contributions to not only our organization as a whole serving on this body, but also a bike and ped and your other advocacy-related roles have been appreciated. So a heartfelt thank you from our staff. We wish you the best of luck. Second announcement, I'm not going anywhere, so don't worry. However tonight, to my right, Mr. Halligan, this is his last meeting. Ross has accepted a job down in the Fort Meyer area, and will be leaving us tomorrow. So it is with great respect that I appreciate you bringing my alma mater to join my side here with our staff and contribute as you have. You have diligently dealt with all of our short-term rental requests, as with others which hopefully have given you a little bit of added experience and so-called planning chops. We will miss you and we do wish you the best as you move forward. Even though we part with staff, as many of you know, I have been down a planner and I've been down a senior planner. Ross happened to make notice to us that he had taken this job as we were completing interviews for the open planner position that had been created by Kirtis Orendorff's departure. Out of that application pool, we were fortunate enough to be able to hire two planners. So I will have two planners starting July 6th. I have a senior planner that will start next Tuesday. Knock on wood, I have a full staff, at least for now. We will hopefully be able to see a little bit of progress made forward on some of our larger topics, i.e. the Comprehensive Plan, but we will be spending some time over the next several months training. So that is where we stand as a staff. At this point, we are continuing to move forward on topics that we have had to delay. I will start to retool a little bit myself and where my energies are placed, and hopefully be able to get a couple of items back on board. We also are nearing a point where we will be going out and doing outreach as it relates to the central city of Columbia design guidelines project. That is something that we are working now with our communication staff on to work with neighborhood associations before we bring our consultant back, which should probably in the fall. Also, CMT, Crawford, Murphy, Tilly, transportation consultants that have been working on our complete streets project will likely be making a presentation to the Commission on the 23rd of July as it relates to the completion of the public engagement side, and general framework of a new complete streets policy and amendments to Appendix A of the UDC. They're going to be providing that. They'll provide the policy to City Council, which would include the appendix amendments, which I anticipate Council to redirect to the Commission since it is an ordinance amendment and that will probably be some time, I imagine, in August, if not September. So we are starting to close the door on some projects that we have been working on. We hope to begin the RFP process at least for our Comprehensive Plan either towards the tail end of this budget year, which would be the end of September, or the beginning of the new fiscal '27 budget year, to be able to put the request out on the street to hopefully have a consultant by the beginning of the new year. We've got a lot of interesting stuff going on, and I'm excited to have an opportunity to have a staff that's moved on and moved up. We've got a staff that we can train and we can bring aboard and work side by side with to move the program forward. It is your diligence as a Commission, that helps us make this a bearable process. Not only has Ms. Ortiz resigned her position, unfortunately, Ms. Stockton had to, as well. Ms. Stockton is traveling abroad with her students. She would have acquired a total of five absences before her return. She made her resignation effective immediately in order to allow an opportunity for her to reapply to become a member of this Planning Commission, should Council want to re-interview her at the earliest opportunity possible. Announcements for our open Commission positions, which would be Ms. Ortiz's, as well as Ms. Stockton's is the 5th of June, so any qualified applicant that is not already in the applicant pool from our last round, is encouraged to apply and put their hat in the ring to become a Commissioner. Mr. Stanton, as many of you are aware, on Monday was reappointed for a new four-year term, so he will be continuing on, And then Andrew Grabau has also been appointed as a new --

Graber?

MR. CRAIG: Grabau. Yeah.

MR ZENNER: Grabau has been appointed as a replacement to Ms. Wilson. So we hopefully will by July, possibly August, have a full contingency of Commissioners. Just so the Commission is aware, the resetting of the attendance clock no longer starts June 1. So we are now working on a rolling 12-month schedule which any absences that you have that go back, are going to count moving forward, and it is not we start fresh. So I will continue to keep the chair updated with where we stand on absences, so you, as Commissioners, can be made aware, so you know where you are, as well. We really would like to keep intact the body that we have, and those that we train. It makes our jobs a whole lot easier. With that, thank you very much for your time and your attention this evening.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Before I let you speak, we're going to embarrass you; is that okay? I just want to echo Mr. Zenner's comments. It's been great serving with you. I've really appreciated watching you kind of take in all this ordinance and new information, and loved getting your perspective, especially as someone who is a walker. It's been really, really great, and we're going to miss you, not just on the Commission, but in our fair city all together. But good luck in the future. Anyone else?

MR. WALTERS: Ditto.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We got some dittos.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I feel so, like, grateful to each of you and to every empty seat, and anyone who sat in these seats before, and staff, of course, and Dalton and Albert and other staff, who do the technology. And just everyone, I feel very thankful to be here. I have learned so much in this time. Actually, not just on the Commission, but just living in Columbia, I've learned so much about myself, and my, like, personal advocacy and, like, what I want the world to look like. And if it weren't for this outlet, I don't what I would -- what I would be doing. Yeah. I'm moving on to a new city where, hopefully, I can get around a little bit easier. That's kind of like the main thing. But, yeah, I'm very thankful, and I -- Columbia will always have a big place in my heart. So, thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you and best wishes. Any further Commissioner comments?
Seeing none.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a motion to adjourn.

DR. GRAY: Move to adjourn.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Gray and seconded, for the last time, by Commissioner Ortiz. Without objection, we stand adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.)

(Off the record.)