

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**July 24, 2025**

**Case Number 216-2025**

**A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Jared Zillig and 105 Meadow Lane, LLC (owners), for approval of a two-lot Replat/Resubdivision of R-2 (Two-family Dwelling) zoned property, constituting a replat of parts of Lot 14 of Garth's Addition, to be known as Meadow Lane Plat 1. This request includes two design adjustments seeking relief from Sections 29-5.1(c)(4)(ii) [Streets] and 29-5.1(d)(2)(ix)[Sidewalks]. The approximately 0.63-acre subject site is located east of the intersection of Meadow Lane and Anderson Avenue, and includes the addresses 105 Meadow Lane and 107 Meadow Lane.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development. The following action is recommended with respect to this request.

- Approve the requested design adjustments to waive requirements for sidewalk construction and dedication of right-of-way along Meadow Lane, pursuant to Sections 29-5.1(c)(4)(ii)[Streets] and 29-5.1(d)(2)(ix) [Sidewalks], and
- Approve the requested two-lot final plat to be known as "Meadow Lane Plat 1".

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contacts with parties to this case outside of the public hearing, please disclose so now. Commissioner Stanton? Disclosure?

MR. STANTON: Not on this one.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Not on this one? I'm sorry. I wrote it down on the wrong one. My apologies. Anyone else disclosing -- nothing? Perfect. Thank you. I have a question. This property is already zoned R-2. Correct?

MR. ORENDORFF: Correct. Both 105 and 107 Meadow Lane, so both of the applying properties are zoned R-2.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. So we're not changing what they can or can't build, we are just allowing them to develop the property -- or platting it.

MR. ORENDORFF: The permitted uses -- right, right. The permitted uses on both properties are staying the same. You know, as mentioned, this all came to be because they were looking for pulling a building permit to do work on 105, couldn't do it because of legal lot size. So nothing in the permitted uses for these two lots are changing.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. And -- and this may be more a question for legal

than for you, but we don't have the same levels of discretion on platting actions as we do on, like, conditional use or zoning actions; is that right?

MR. ORENDORFF: I will defer that one.

MR. CRAIG: I can field that one, yeah. As long as the plat satisfies the conditions of the UDC, it's really an administrative act. There is case law on that that there's not really any discretion for the Commission, unlike a Conditional Use Permit or even a change of zoning. If it complies, it's -- it's administrative and must be approved.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So the question before us today is where are the lot lines and where are the easements, and do they have to build a sidewalk?

MR. CRAIG: And doesn't conflict with the UDC.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Yeah. But --

MR. CRAIG: Yeah. And then the two design adjustments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. CRAIG: Which I would recommend be handled independently.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Separately.

MR. CRAIG: So three votes, all together. The design adjustments individually first, and then finally the plat.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. Any other questions for staff? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Well, just going off of what legal just recommended, I note the design adjustments are grouped together in the presentation. So -- so we're separating them out, the sidewalk and the easements, and then voting on them separately?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Correct.

MS. ORTIZ: But the recommendation from staff is the same for each?

MR. ORENDORFF: Right. So staff recommends that both design adjustments maintain the -- the current unique character of the site, and would not affect in a negative manner the existing conditions. So a lot of the reasoning for approving or recommending approval for both of those maintain the same. So for simplicity sake, because I already had 16 slides, I pinned a bunch of them together.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Just wanted to clarify that in my head. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. 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 wish to come forward, please do so now. Well, hang on, Jay. Let me get my stopwatch going. Go ahead.

MR. GEBHARDT: If I could get the slides put up. I don't know how to do it, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. They have to do it in the back now.

MR. GEBHARDT: There's magic that happens right here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. GEBHARDT: Okay.

MR. CRAIG: Jay, could we get your name on the record, again, since this is --

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes. My name is Jay Gebhardt; I'm a civil engineer with A Civil Group. I'm here tonight representing 105 Meadow Lane, which is Mike and Jewell Keevins, and also Jared Zillig who owns -- thank you, Pat. So I wanted to go through this. I believe there's some people in the audience that want to speak about this, so I thought I would go through and provide some information. And thank you, Kirtis and thank you, Pat, for the introduction and the staff report. So it is zoned R-2, and I just went ahead and said that the -- there's a garage on the property that is on the current lot line between the two homes. It's a shared garage, and that is not allowed. And then I just went ahead, and even though this is not a rezoning, I went ahead for just education purposes put the permitted uses that are allowed on that. We're requesting to -- (inaudible) -- two lots into two legal lots, so there's no additional lots being requested and no change in zoning. This is really because of the definition of a lot in the UDC, this does not comply. So there is no building permits going to be issued for any -- both of these structures. And so this is the only mechanism we have to create those lots to be legal, and that's the purpose of the plat. When we do the plat, of course, it triggers all the UDC requirements, which I tried to make the argument that this east-west section of Meadow Lane was an alley, which would be compliant, but it fell on deaf ears. So here we are. We don't want to dedicate an additional 15 feet. As staff pointed out, the house to the west of us -- west of Jared's house is also a lot that's a survey that does not comply with legal-lot status. And if it were to be dedicated, that 15 foot would fall within the house. So it's just not -- it's trying to take a green field standard and apply to an older neighborhood, and it just doesn't fit. And so our goal is to create these two legal lots and, as part of that, negotiation between Jared and the Keevins. The Keevins are giving up land. Their lot is actually getting smaller, and -- and Jared is going to take over the garage for himself. In exchange for that, he provided an additional ten feet of access easement, so we have a total of 20 feet, which staff felt was more appropriate than the existing ten feet. So it's kind of a win-win for the two owners. They worked together. This -- staff had put on -- we've been thinking about this for a while, and it's nice that Jared and Mike were able work together to -- to put this together. This is just a quick aerial to kind of show the neighborhood. This is the zoning map. The dark yellow, of course, is R-2, and the light yellow is R-1. The R-2 lots, you can see, is 105 and 107 Meadow Lane there. This is a copy of the original survey by Jim Patchett. It was done in 1973. The houses were built, I believe, sometime after 1935, and they were owned by the Mendenhalls as one lot -- two homes on one lot. And in 1973 when they sold it, they -- the Mendenhalls surveyed it and I take it that was legal in 1973 to do it that way. And when that -- but if you go back to the definition of the legal lot, it has to have occurred prior to 1965, so this is the catch of why we have two existing homes that are lots that we can't get a building permit on. So this is a copy of the overall plat, you know. We'll zoom in here. I show where the current property line is that goes through the garage, and then we show how we're reconfiguring that line so that Jared has a compliant garage with the required minimum three-foot setback from the line. And that angle in the line that you see is so that Mike can get access to the sanitary sewer, which is on the property to

the east of us there. So it angles up just so that we have room to get into that sewer on Mike's property. And then in exchange for the additional land and the garage, Jared was kind enough to go ahead and agree to an additional ten feet. It actually fits the gravel driveway that's there now better with the 20 feet. So -- so, like, I said, this is kind of a win-win for the two owners. I understand there's a lot of confusion, I guess, with the neighborhood that we're redeveloping. The Keevins originally purchased this home. The foundation is -- was in bad shape. They went to the lengths of hiring a structural engineer to design a plan to lift the house and put a new foundation underneath it. And what -- the costs just kept mounting up and up, and it just became clear that the house needed to come down. There was just other problems that kept manifesting, so they will, if this approved, they would like to get a building permit to build a two-family -- not a two single family attached, but a two-family structure on this. And having said that, if anybody has questions, I would be glad to answer them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Gebhardt? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: The next member of the public that wishes to speak on this case, please come forward. Anyone? Oh, there you come. You're going to have to pull that microphone down towards you, ma'am. Thank you.

MS. ROGERS: My name is Carol Rogers. I live at 111 Anderson. I've lived there for 50 years. And the adjustments of not following the sidewalk and the street width adjustments are good because we don't want -- I mean, that would be crazy in that neighborhood that's so old to even consider that. So there's no problem in my opinion with that. What -- we have a big -- or I have a big problem with is the City staff gave the project technical approval, which includes traffic congestion, saying that it would not be an issue, and storm water impervious surface. Other people are going to get up and talk who live right on Meadow Lane, and they're going to address this better. But it would make a huge difference traffic congestion-wise. That one photo that you guys -- someone had up there that showed going north on -- south on Meadow Lane, it was -- yeah, that. Okay. It looks like Meadow is pretty wide. Right? Yes? Yes. So most of Meadow Lane, and like I said, people who live on it will address it clearer, there's always cars parked on both sides, so that's kind of a misleading -- misleading photograph. And then you turn the corner, it is a one-way, one-lane road. So you have two ways to get to this duplex that he wants to build on his lot, when it becomes a legal lot. The only way is through that driveway, you either have to drive on Meadow Lane, which always has cars to the point where you can't pass another car, and the -- I'm sorry - - east-west aspect, so -- and then the stormwater issue, there's big stormwater problems in the alley, which is -- you can't really see it, but it's to the west of the photo there. The City is aware of that. They've come out, they've looked at it. It probably is part of the reason that, like, Glenwood and Aldeah have basements that flood. So if you're going to put all this more impervious surface, you're going to put the 12-foot concrete driveway -- and I talked to the staff. They said that would be like a -- (inaudible) -- 40 or 50 feet. You're going to have the footprint of the building, the roof, that's going to add more stormwater,

and there's already a problem there, so if there's already a problem there, it would seem as if you would not want to add more stormwater to a place that's already causing a problem for residents in the neighborhood. We all feel extremely passionate about this because we love our neighborhood, and we want a -- I know Kirtis laughed at this today. We want a traffic study done to say that, no, it's not appropriate to have that there. And we also want some clarification about since there's already a water - a stormwater problem, how can you then add more impervious surface to that area. And we would hope you guys would say no to this, but I think you're going to okay it, and I want you to know that there's plans to have it taken off the consent agenda at the City Council meeting, that it is voted on. I think that's September 1st. And we're going to ask that it be taken off the consent agenda so we can pinpoint to the City Council what we feel the issues are.

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

MR. STANTON: Thank you for your presentation. So I'm going to play that other guy.

MS. ROGERS: Okay.

MR. STANTON: This is an illegal lot, not in control of the owners at all. What is your solution, because if we don't make this legal lot, we've got a hunk of land that you can't do anything with. They have to leave it as is, and flip that on you. And say that it was your land, so what is your solution, from your perspective, and I know you're not an engineer. I'm not, either.

MS. ROGERS: Oh, no.

MR. STANTON: But if the shoe was on the other foot, and you were stuck in this dilemma yourself, what would your solution be to your neighbors and to yourself that makes it a win-win for both people, both parties?

MS. ROGERS: Okay. The impervious surface and the stormwater issue, to -- I mean, this is their land and they're -- you know, they can do what they want with it. But we would hope that then if we had a way to make it happen the way we want, to have a very small footprint to minimize impervious surfaces, to make the driveway -- you know, you can have a country driveway that has, like, a checkered pad, and in the middle of each little square, there's grass, and that absorbs water and it negates some of the stormwater issues. Also, just to make it a small footprint. You know, you can see the driveway to the right there with that red car. That was also a duplex that was put in similar to what they're requesting. See all of the concrete? They didn't just make two normal size driveways; they concreted this path circle, and we don't want that kind of stuff. So that's one thing that I would do to address that. To address the traffic issue, I know it's their land, and I know it's R-2. We would ask that it be a small duplex. Right now, it could be a four bedroom duplex with students. Two in each bedroom. I mean, that's allowed. And look at the traffic that would occur. So we, if it was up to me, I would say please make it really a single-family house, but if not that, a duplex with two bedrooms on either side that have garages on both sides where the cars could park, so that there's not cars all down this 130 foot driveway. That's what I would do.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much for being here tonight. Next speaker on this issue, please come forward. And if the next person who wants to speak wants to come and sit on the front row, that would be great. Thank you.

MS. MISEO: Hi. Thank you. My name is Mel Constantine Miseo; I live at 109 Meadow Lane. And I don't have opposition to them making these legal lots, but I do have concerns about the future developments that will be on this lot. So I've lived at Meadow -- 109 Meadow Lane for nine years. This is right at the corner of the main Meadow Lane and the tiny alley-ish street that is between my house and 107 Meadow. My household has consistently had issues with traffic on Meadow Lane, especially since we don't really have a driveway. Meadow Lane is extremely narrow and essentially operates as a one-way street. I've had to move my car many times for large trucks that pass through if there are cars parked on both sides of that street. I regularly have to back up down the street to allow a car coming in the opposite direction to pass me so that we don't have a head-on collision. Because of the amount of cars that are regularly parked on the street, which further narrows the street, cars and trucks drive over my yard when coming around the corner. This increased traffic caused by the development of a potential duplex is a safety concern for me. Another safety concern is that the additional traffic being added on the street due to the potential duplex is that the guests of current residents and the renters of the three Airbnbs that are on our small street occasionally park in front of the fire hydrant that is on the already overcrowded street. Our street is already at or over capacity, and I just have concerns about this project making it worse.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. And you said you don't have any issues with the platting action or the design adjustments though; is that correct?

MS. MISEO: Correct. Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Because those are the only things we get to vote on tonight.

MS. MISEO: Yes. And I don't think sidewalks would be good on the street, and it makes sense to make them both legal lots, and I'm glad that, you know, they're in agreement on that, but I have concerns about the future development of this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure. I just want to make sure both you and everyone else listening is very clear that we don't get to decide the things that you're concerned about tonight.

MS. MISEO: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We just get to decide the lot lines and the -- the design adjustments.

MS. MISEO: Yeah. I understand that.

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

MS. HALEY: Hello. My name is Donna Haley, and I live at 22 Anderson. And my house -- my backyard is adjacent or connects with Jared, which is 107, his backyard. And so I am -- I live -- my -- my driveway goes into Meadow Lane on that 20-foot-wide part, and so I'm very grateful about what is in the proposal about waiving having sidewalks. I would have to take down a lot of trees. I don't even know if

you could do it with -- and still leave my house standing. But anyway, so I didn't know about that until I came tonight. So I'm glad about that. I guess what -- and I think that I understand what you're voting on tonight, and, of course, I have the same concerns people are saying about, well, what may happen in the future. But what I am concerned about what was said tonight was that the whole thing about kind of waive that saying within this and maybe you're not voting on it, but saying that there's not a traffic issue, and there's already a traffic issue. And it will only get worse. And so we have many examples of -- of -- I mean, for me, often I have to back up because somebody is coming down the street. I know that -- I mean, that -- it's just, we live with it, you know, but that also, you know, in the last few years, a person added a duplex, and it increased -- the problem increased, too, so this is only worse. So to hear that about to you -- that you've used some formula to say that there won't be that much of an impact, I -- I guess I have an issue with, and so I just wanted to -- to raise that. And, of course, I think it's unknown about how many people, how many cars, and I've lived in this area. I lived on Glenwood for 30 years and now I've here 15, so I've been kind of in that area 50 years just like many of these people are. So, you know, we just want to preserve our neighborhood as much as we can and I guess that was the main thing is just to really be aware of that. And I do want to thank you. I've talked to Kirtis on the phone and your staff has been great, so thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. We appreciate that. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you, ma'am. Next?

MS. GARDENER: My name is Christine Gardener; I live at 112 Anderson Avenue. My property backs up to that -- the private alley that goes behind all the houses between Meadow Lane and that part of Anderson, just that half of the block. And I want to address the stormwater issues, and I know you're not going to vote on this tonight, but my question is, knowing that we have failing infrastructure, inadequate stormwater services, and this has continued for as long as I've lived in the neighborhood, which has been since 1984, when are we going to address this problem? As you continue to talk about infill, we're not opposed to infill, but we do not have the infrastructure to handle it, so how is this going to come out? Right now, there's a private alley. It's not, you know, owned by the City. Every person along that alley owns to the middle of the alley. There was never a proper storm drain put in. There is something there. I was out one day when Public Works had a staff person out there showing me this sort of storm drain sort of thing that goes under the surface of the alley, but it floods on both sides and doesn't take care of the problem. Where that water goes, I'm sure it goes right down to Aldeah and Glenwood. So this property that is being looked at for redevelopment is uphill from this problem. All of the -- all of the impervious surface that is going to be put in is going to increase the amount of water going down into the alley, into that ancient whatever it is, storm drain kind of thing, and we already know that there are people on Glenwood and Aldeah that have serious problems from stormwater. And so I don't know how this can be addressed, but it certainly needs to be. And if you're going to continue to try to infill and increase density in the already most densified area of the City -- we are dense -- we are the densest -- and not fix our infrastructure problems, we will be back to talk about this some more. When will that stormwater be

issue -- issue be taken care of? We don't know. But we could have further development that impacts that. Thank you very much.

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

MR. WALTERS: I do.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Thank you. You've lived there over 40 years. Have -- do you have a neighborhood association? Do you have a neighborhood association in the area?

MS. GARDENER: Yes. West Ash Neighborhood Association.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. And there's probably others that are adjacent to you. Have you and the association approached the City to encourage this mitigation of the drainage issues?

MS. GARDENER: Not this particular issue, but we have been at this table many times talking about infrastructure -- stormwater, sewer are a particular problem. But then the streets, also, we don't have, you know, sidewalks. We can't even fit sidewalks in this particular area, but all these -- all these things are not addressed in the First Ward.

MR. WALTERS: And is Glenwood, which is to the east here, is the -- are the houses on Glenwood part of your association, or is that a separate association?

MS. GARDENER: Yes. They're a part of our association.

MR. WALTERS: Part of your association.

MS. GARDENER: And they are downhill from where I live in that alley and this place that we're discussing right now.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Just a point of information. We have a lot of new Commissioners here. West Ash is a very powerful neighborhood association, one of the most active in the City. So their words have a lot of weight, and thank you for saying that you -- it's very active, so thank you.

MS. GARDENER: Thank you.

MS. ORTIZ: I have a question.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, sorry. Commissioner Ortiz, go ahead.

MS. ORTIZ: Oh, God, did I lose it? Oh. Have you talked to your neighbor, the person that --

MS. GARDENER: Which neighbors?

MS. ORTIZ: I guess, both of them that are -- that are requesting this lot be made legal?

MS. GARDENER: We have spoken with one. The other one is here by A Civil Group I don't -- we have not had any interaction with that gentleman. I understand that there have been some complaints in the past about his lack of neighborliness, but that's about what I know.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. I was just curious. If you looped them in, maybe -- I don't know -- there could be a more --

MS. GARDENER: We don't have problems with the change in their lot lines. Our problem is if -



- if development goes in there, how large is the coverage of the building going to be, how much impervious surface is going to be put in, and the -- until these other problems with traffic and impervious surface, we're going to -- we're going to live with the problems that roll down the line from this. So we're trying to avoid that, if we can.

MS. ORTIZ: That's great. And as you know, that's not what we're voting on.

MS. GARDENER: We all know that.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Okay. Just want to be sure, yeah. Okay.

MS. GARDENER: We all know that.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MS. GARDENER: We are talking about a bigger issue.

MS. ORTIZ: Yes, I know.

MS. GARDENER: But where else do we go?

MS. ORTIZ: Right.

MS. GARDENER: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next?

MS. MITCHELL: One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty -- that's how wide -- my name is Laura Mitchell; I live at 209 Ridgeway, and I'm the president of the West Ash Neighborhood Association. This is a tiny street. When you take that corner, it doesn't look like a street anymore. It looks like somebody's driveway. If a -- if a fire truck had to get down there, and Mel was at home to move her car, what do they do, push it out of the way? It's already dangerous. It's dangerous when people come around that blind corner. It's -- it's just -- it's a little, old street, and somebody is talking about putting something modern size on it. We have wider streets, but this isn't one of them. So I'm -- I'm really wanting this to not go through on the consent agenda. And I did have one other thing. Commissioner Stanton asked what we would have this person do. And I think in some sense, that's not really the question. People buy land multiple times. You know, it's not uncommon for somebody to buy land with a certain goal in mind, and not have it approved. It's possible that if the person wanted to withdraw this request, and ask to be replatted for R-1, that would be a better solution for our neighborhood. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much, Ms. Mitchell. Oh, I'm sorry. Are you good? Okay. Thank you.

MS. DOKKEN: Dee Dokken, 804 Again Street. I want to borrow a term from Jay Gebhardt who said the only alternative left for them is to ask for these adjustments, because it is an old, nearly 100 year development. I would say the only alternative left to us is please deny this and let them come back and say, yes, we will make some adjustments for this old development pattern, and for the stormwater problem. They could say -- they could say -- they could down-zone into R-1. I'd say there is no acting like they have -- this whole area should be developed in R-2 is not reasonable based on the history of this area, how it was mass zoned R-2, and how it was developed in a mosaic of R-2 and R-1. So I think if you

deny this, there can be more of a give and take. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for Ms. Dokken? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Well, I have a comment. If -- whether it's R-1 or R-2, these two design adjustments would be required. Correct? It's for -- it's for to waive sidewalk and to expand the right of way.

MS. DOKKEN: But the only leverage is for you all to deny that this time until they make some kind of agreements that how they are going to develop it when the lot lines are changed. It's not just automatic, whatever you can do in R-2.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So Dee -- sorry. I hear what I think you all are asking us to do, which is basically use this as a leverage problem.

MS. DOKKEN: To me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Just you.

MS. DOKKEN: I'm not speaking for --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I know you're not here on behalf of a group. We don't have the kind of latitude when it comes to platting that we do on everything else that we do. It's -- it's a -- is it technically compliant, isn't it. There is no character of neighborhood criteria or any of that. There is in the design adjustments, but the answers to all of those, even given the neighbors' testimony, is these are appropriate design adjustments for the land. I guess my question is, and -- and maybe you don't have a good answer, but how do we get to a place where we're recognizing that people are in a spot with the property that they own, because even if you wanted to build a single-family home, you can't do that unless we voted yes on both things tonight.

MR. DOKKEN: Or if he was building a single-family home, we would not be up here asking you to vote no on the design adjustments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry. That was your time, but you didn't use it all. Yeah. I understand that, but his intention isn't what's before us. What's before us is a very technical question.

MS. DOKKEN: As Jay said, our only alternative is to ask for this. I can see where it makes -- it just seems like, yes, we have to just pass this through. But then we lose, you know, any ability to affect what's happening. We are waiting for a central neighborhood design guidelines, you know, that process.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh. An overlay -- yeah.

MS. DOKKEN: And this is being pushed -- among many other things that are happening in our neighborhood, it's being pushed in without us being able to affect it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Finish the overlay, yeah.

MS. DOKKEN: Thank you for listening.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Yeah. Yes. Anybody else? Okay. Oh, sorry. If anyone -- okay. Yeah. Any other members of the public to speak on this case? Last call. I'm looking for movement. Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

## **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, I know the guidance that we got from legal. This is basically a technical matter. I have a -- well, number one, I have a problem with somebody just pushing me into a direction and telling me what I've got to do and what I'd better do. I have a problem with that. I support the -- the platting action, but as we hear the testimony, when we do that, do we leave the citizens any other recourse? Where do they address their issues concerning what's next? Yes, this is technical from our end. I've heard some of my colleagues say, hey, what's the problem. Let's get the plat, let's move it on, and, hey, blah, blah, blah. That is always the road, the slippery road that when we don't have any other recourse for our citizens to, like a lot that have testified, leverage for what they need. I'm all about -- I'm all about property rights. I'm all about that. I don't hear the communication between owner and citizens, and blah, blah, blah, and are they listening and I don't know. I plan to support it, but somebody has got to tell me how does the citizens help or I would just blow it up. Somebody has got to tell me how does -- what's the next step the citizens have to voice their opinion with teeth, or I can't support this. I've got to have a path for the -- for the citizens in the next step, and it's got to be bigger than being on the consent. What else happens? We all know. We're hearing the most of it. When it gets to the next step, I -- I just don't have faith it's going to have a robust discussion. How does the citizens move this forward?

MS. GEUEA JONES: When you say this forward, do you mean their concerns about stormwater and traffic, or the concerns about having a duplex in the neighborhood?

MR. STANTON: A little bit of both. Now, you know, because the way my perception is, we give them the plat, it's all full blaze ahead, whatever happens happens.

MS. GEUEA JONES: They have to --

MR. STANTON: Convince me otherwise or I'm -- I'm not convinced.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So I think that, I mean, wow, it feels like a weird juxtaposition for you to be on that side and me to be on this one. But I feel like there is no recourse for a neighbor to tell another neighbor this is what I want you to do or not do with your neighbor -- with your property, as long as all of the other legal requirements are met. Some of those legal requirements are stormwater management and driveway requirements and life safety requirements and the ability for the fire department to get in the area and all of that kind of stuff. But, you know, my -- my neighbors may or may not have been particularly happy with me when I put an addition on my home. They can't stop that as long as I'm going it within Code, and having pulled all of the appropriate permits. So, to me, that's not the question. Now there is a question of why is the City not addressing the improvements on Meadow Lane that have become, it sounds like, a serious issue up to and including blocking life safety from getting in there -- ambulances, fire, that sort of thing, blocking fire hydrants, all of that. That's a real issue. Why is the City not addressing the stormwater runoff? I can tell you I don't live that far from here, and some of that water is in my backyard. And I clean up trash on a -- every time there's a storm, I walk through my backyard and pick up everybody's trash. So those two issues are real and they are not being addressed, but short

of something like a neighborhood overlay, I don't know how they could tell someone you've been zoned R-2 for 50 years, and acknowledgment of the history of how and why that happened, but you've been R-2 for 50 years. We don't want you to build a duplex. I don't know how you do that in a society where we recognize private property rights.

MR. STANTON: You can go ahead.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead. Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: More a question for staff, you know, just procedurally. So we have criteria that we're supposed to look at when we're approving conditioning use permits or, like, when the Board of Adjustment is doing -- is doing variances. As far as the waivers go, what are we supposed to be, you know, considering to allow a waiver?

MR. CRAIG: The design adjustments, you mean?

MR. BRODSKY: Yes. Yes.

MR. CRAIG: They're -- they're in the presentation, and in the staff report here.

MR. BRODSKY: Yeah. Okay. I'm sorry. I must have missed that.

MR. ORENDORFF: So I'll run through them just really quickly here just like -- we have five different sign adjustment criteria that we, as staff, take a look at and do the analysis on the existing conditions, any imposed hardships that exist on the site, and what they're trying to accomplish by getting these requirements waived. So consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, create significant adverse impacts, dangerous for automobiles, pedestrians, and bicyclists, to address a unique feature of the site, and will not create adverse impacts on public health and safety. So that's what we used to do that analysis.

MR. BRODSKY: Got it. No. Sorry I missed that. And then the other question I had for you, Jesse, are we -- you know, there are some things we can put conditions on. Is this one of those things that we can put conditions on?

MR. CRAIG: A plat?

MR. BRODSKY: Yeah.

MR. CRAIG: Or a subdivision?

MR. BRODSKY: Yeah. Well, the plat, the waivers, just kind of the whole --

MR. CRAIG: No. Absolutely not.

MR. BRODSKY: I didn't think so.

MR. CRAIG: If it comports -- if it comports with the UDC, it -- it then kind of, you lose discretion as a body as to whether you can put conditions on it or -- yeah. So it's sort of a binary decision of this body, so there's no conditions on just the -- the platting action itself.

MR. BRODSKY: Got you. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Okay. So we can't make -- we don't have any leverage on the plat -- the platting action?

MR. CRAIG: No.

MR. STANTON: But we do have leverage on the adjustments, the design adjustments up or down?

MR. CRAIG: I'm not following what you mean by leverage.

MR. STANTON: Okay. So --

MR. CRAIG: You have to follow the criteria that's before you.

MR. STANTON: Okay. This is my point. Why is it in front of me if I can't argue it? If this is an administrative action, then this should have just got pushed through. What you're telling me is did you put a case in front of me and it says, A, vote yeah. Why are you even discussing it? Why do we even have this for debate if this is something we can't even discuss. This is, basically, a go, and we really, according to our guidelines, don't even have the right to say no go.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Stanton, the conditions that are in the request for a design adjustment are evaluated from staff's perspective based on its understanding and its belief of the requests compliance with the criteria. It is to the extent your duty as a Commission to evaluate that criteria. You can question it. You can question staff's conclusions, and you can vote as you believe it either or is not met. So we're not telling you you have to take our vote or our recommendation. We are telling you from our staff's perspective as it relates to all conditions being considered what we believe to be the appropriate course of action. That is not meant to be implied that you must vote that way. And so if these design adjustments are denied, the plat cannot be approved as it has been submitted unless the applicant is willing to dedicate the required half width and install sidewalks, which I believe is the testimony as presented this evening, is not what the neighborhood would like. And so we come back to the crux of the question and the concern that has been expressed. They do not like the type of building that is going to go here. But you are not at all barred from voting as you believe fit or questioning where our analysis came from as it relates to the criteria.

MR. STANTON: So my understanding of the guidance that we got today was that we really don't have any legal teeth to say yes or no on the plat, because it's technical.

MR. ZENNER: On the plat. That is correct. On the design adjustments, you still have the ability of a --

MR. STANTON: That's my point I was making. I have movement on the design adjustments. I may not be able to say yes or no on the plat, technically, because it's sound. But I have -- I can up or down these adjustments. Correct?

MR. CRAIG: Yes. But your consideration must be -- must be contained within the -- the enumerated considerations here that you're allowed to consider by -- by ordinance.

MR. STANTON: It seems like I'm going in a circle, so I'm going to let it go for right now, but just for the record, what is a citizen to do at this point, at this junction, once this plat is through? We have heard all this testimony from the neighborhood. We have heard all of this. I want this on the record when it goes to City Council. What guidance does a citizen have? If I was on the other side of this, I would feel

like I'm getting railroaded through. It doesn't seem like the owner -- I mean, we heard from the engineer. I could just be making this up. I don't hear a win-win. Nobody is trying to come up and make a move, so I feel like the owner is on their position and there is no other recourse but to push this through, and I have no other way when it gets to City Council to voice my opinion to have any teeth.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Well, I -- so -- okay. I -- I trust that this neighborhood has the knowledge and the power to have the best discussion about this at the City Council meeting if this does get approved. They already said they want it to be removed from the consent agenda. All they have to do is request that. And we can also make a motion after this has passed to put it on old business, so we know -- we have the recourse. We know what to do to make sure this conversation continues. If -- I love sidewalks, and if you would have came up and said I want there to be sidewalks in my neighborhood, I would have easily denied the design adjustment, but that's not what you said. You came up here and you said I don't care about sidewalks, I don't care about the easement. What I care about is more people living in my neighborhood. Not going to happen. That's where I'm at.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: If I lived in the neighborhood for the past 40 years, I would organize and I'd get people to sign a petition asking the Public Works Department and get my City Council person to organize such a meeting with the Public Works Department and bring this to the attention of whomever regarding to get money appropriated to address these problems. I looked at the -- you look -- I didn't drive down the street, but I looked at these maps here. The streets themselves all -- in addition to being narrow, they don't have much of a curb, which contributes to the flooding. If they had adequate -- adequate streets and curbing, they would -- that would take care of a lot of their problem. But a lot of that costs, often when it comes to reconstructing streets, unless it's a major capital improvements project, part of the citizens have to pay their way. Like for every lineal foot, there would be a fee that would be calculated saying, well, you have 100 feet of frontage, we're going to put a new curb in front of you and widen the street, and your -- your part of it would be X, and most people won't do that. So anyway, I just think there's things they can do, and they should do, in addition to the upcoming meeting to express their concerns is to get their City Council person and get the Public Works Department to review this, and get some -- get some comments on the record. It sounds like they have power to do it. You've got enough people, and you said the existing homeowners association is strong, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I'm -- I'm always for discussion and people talking to each other, so one of the things that we heard was that we spoke with one neighbor, but not the other. And I think it would be good to speak to the other. I also think it would be good in having that conversation and negotiation to also consider whatever is happening in the neighborhood now. The person who is building is also going to be experiencing whatever is going to happen. Right? They're going to experience the flooding. They're going to experience the traffic. They're going to experience the problems. I'm seeing some nos.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: Excuse me, please.

MS. WILSON: If they don't experience it directly, they'll experience it with the dissatisfaction of their neighbors. So there's going to be -- I just think that there needs to be discussion. If we have such a powerful voice as a neighborhood association, that voice should be used to also discuss with the neighbors who live in the neighborhood. Talk to each other. You're here tonight. Talk to each other.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Fellow Commissioners, bless your heart. I would love to be that idealistic and say talk to my congressman and it'll be okay. You sign a petition. Work the -- work the angles of -- of democracy and it'll all work out. That's not real world. That's not how things work here. That's not how I go. I don't know where you stayed. That -- that ain't by -- I never seen that kind of place. We have these systems in place, but we all know that, number one, you need time, and a lot of times those people, we're too busy -- we're too busy working ten to 12-hour shifts, and we say, hi lobbyist, and we can do all that. But when I said that you shouldn't do due diligence, I'm not saying that. But the ideal that, you know, we do this and go talk to your City Councilman and talk to your Congressman, and he'll do -- it will be a -- that's not how it really works. It takes people like myself up here to bring light to this and expose and teach the citizenry what they can do so we can play chess, because this is what it takes. It takes citizens versus whatever to play chess, and I hope you guys -- we hope -- which all this is good advice. We need to play chess, not checkers here. We need to be strategic. I understand that this is, you know, already going down the road. But we did hear my colleague, you know, let's write petitions, let's -- let's do all that, too, but don't stop running your mouth. Don't stop coming up here being loud and talking and lining up and keeping us here all night. That's what it's going to take. And doing the consent agenda and all that good stuff, yes, we need to do that. But the reality is that that's not how the real world works. That -- the system is in place, but that's not how the system works. I'm just saying this so this is all on record. We know that this has got to -- I support the plat. I'm concerned after the plat, but we'll just have to wait and see.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I just want to respond to Commissioner Stanton that if -- if the public testimony was in regards to the design adjustments, we would have more -- more leverage in that way. But that's not what the testimony was presented tonight. So we -- we don't have that. So it is about thinking strategically, absolutely, and using the power that you have, but given the testimony, we -- we don't have that, in my opinion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Yeah. I think for me this boils down to kind of a decision between two paths. One, do we -- are we going to not do the waivers because we want to maybe restrict the intensity of what's going to go on on this property to -- to match the roads and the stormwater issues, or do we -- do we continue, you know, increasing density in the -- in these areas and do we urge City Council that, you

know, hey, maybe we need to match the roads and the infrastructure in these areas so that these areas can be developed to the extent that they need to be developed, or that I think the City desires them to be developed. And for me, I think it's probably going to boil down more to the latter. I would rather see this get approved, have these waivers happen, and -- and see the City come in and -- and, you know, make some of these infrastructure changes to accommodate this kind of development. So for me, at least, I'm going to approve this and I do think that we have enough justification to issue the waivers.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Very good. Would anyone like to make a motion?  
Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 216-2025, 105 Meadow Lane, final plat and design adjustments, I move to approve the requested design adjustments to waiver requirements.

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. It will just be streets first.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. I'm doing the adjustments first. Right?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Just end at streets and then do a second adjustment just on sidewalks.

MR. STANTON: Oh, got -- yeah. Got it. Waiver requirements for -- so I skip the sidewalk construction?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Dedicated right-of-way along Meadow Lane pursuant to Section 29-5.1(c)(4)(ii) streets.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And then stop.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion to approve the first design adjustment related to the street right-of-way made by Commissioner Stanton, and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. When you're ready, Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call.

MR. BRODSKY: Just a reminder, we're voting on the waiver for the street right-of-way dedication.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Dr. Gray. The motion carries 8-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Is there another motion on this case? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 216-2025, I move to approve the requested design adjustment to waiver requirements for sidewalk construction pursuant to Section 29-5.1(d)(2)(ix) sidewalks.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: The motion on the design adjustment related to sidewalks made by Commissioner Stanton, and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. May we have a roll call, Mr. -- Commissioner Brodsky?



**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Dr. Gray. Voting No: Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Geuea Jones. The motion carries 6-2.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: By what vote?

MR. BRODSKY: Six to two.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Is there another motion on this case?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 216-2025, I move to approve the requested two-lot final plat to be known as Meadow Lane Plat 1.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion on the platting action made by Commissioner Stanton, and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting yes is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Dr. Gray. The motion carries 8-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Is there any further motion on this case? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Oh. Oh, you might need to help me. I -- I move to have -- at the Council meeting that this appears on, I move to have this moved to Old Business.

MR. CRAIG: Yeah. They can be styled as a request.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So we don't need to vote on that, we can just request it?

MR. CRAIG: Well, you can -- it can be voted on.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CRAIG: It just -- as a technical matter, this -- this Commissioner by itself doesn't have the authority to take it off of the --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Ah.

MR. CRAIG: So you can ask to have it off, and it will likely be taken off, if requested, but it is -- it is a request to have it taken off consent, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you need Commissioner Ortiz to restate her motion as a request?

MR. CRAIG: Sure.

MS. ORTIZ: I move to request that this item be moved to Old Business on the City Council agenda.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion to request City Council to place this on Old Business made by Commissioner Ortiz, and seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion. Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, give us one more roll call, please.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Dr. Gray. Motion carries 8-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: That motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Those recommendations and requests will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to our next case, and just as a matter of procedure, if any of my fellow Commissioners need to take a break, we have enough to do that in turns. Okay. Moving on.