

**MINUTES**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**JUNE 5, 2025**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

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

**STAFF**

**Mr. Pat Zenner**  
**Mr. Rusty Palmer**  
**Mr. David Kunz**  
**Mr. Ross Halligan**  
**Mr. Kirtis Orendorff**  
**Mr. Jesse Craig**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Good evening. I will call the June 5, 2025 session of the Planning and Zoning Commission of Columbia to order.

**II. INTRODUCTIONS**

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

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: I am here. Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Stockton?

MS. STOCKTON: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: And Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: We have a quorum.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

### **III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any changes to our agenda this evening, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

MR. STANTON: I move to approve the agenda.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner

Ortiz. Is there a thumbs up approval of the agenda?

(Unanimous vote for approval)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. Excellent.

### **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moving on to the minutes. We all received a copy of the minutes. Are there any changes or adjustments to said minutes? Seeing none. Is there a motion?

MR. STANTON: I move to approve the minutes.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz.

Seeing no discussion, thumbs up approval on the minutes?

(Six votes for approval; three abstentions.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Excellent. Unanimous with abstentions from Commissioners Darr, Stanton and Gray.

### **V. WITHDRAWN ITEMS**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moving on to our first order of business, Withdrawn Items.

#### **Case Number 158-2025**

**A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of Discovery Business Park 1 LLC, 4900 Artemis LLC, and P1316 LLC, (owners) for approval of an amendment to Lot 5 Discovery Business Park PD plan and its associated statement of intent to permit 11 single-bedroom apartments as an allowable use on a proposed second floor within the existing building on Lot 5.**

**The proposed revision will impact Lot 5 of the overall PD Plan located at the intersection of Artemis Drive and Nocona Parkway and includes the address 5000 Artemis Drive.**

MS. GEUEA JONES: This item is being withdrawn. May we have a staff report?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. As noted on the slide in front of you, as well as just read within the public record, this item has been withdrawn by the applicant from further consideration. This was the only lot in our more recently heard case, Case Number 92-2025, that would have been allowed to have been further pursued short of a more comprehensive amendment as it relates to tracts 4, 5, and 9 of Discovery Park. The applicant has decided to withdraw consideration of converting the building into both a commercial and a residential space. There -- this was a tabled to public hearing date, so if there is anyone in the audience that was here to make comment on that, typical practice would be to allow them to do so, but staff has not prepared a report and there is no formal action by the Planning Commissioner required.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Out of courtesy, is anyone here from the public to speak on this case on the 5000 Artemis Drive case? Seeing none. Thank you very much, and we need no further action. Correct?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Excellent. Moving on then.

## **VI. SUBDIVISIONS**

### **Case Number 192-2025**

**A request by Engineering Surveys & Services (agent), on behalf of Alive in Christ Lutheran Church, Inc. (owner) for approval of a one-lot final minor plat to be known as "Alive in Christ Subdivision Plat 2." The subject 20.14-acre property is zoned R-1 (One-family Dwelling) and is located at 201 Southampton Drive.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and development Department. Staff's recommendation would be to approve the final plat of Alive in Christ Subdivision Plat 2, subject to minor 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 a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Seeing none. Thank you very much. We will go to public comment.

### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any member of the public wishes to comment on this case, please come forward. We will need your name and address for the record. We give six minutes to the applicant and groups, and three minutes to individuals.

MR. CARROZ: Fred Carroz, Engineering Surveys & Services, 1113 Fay Street. I'm here to answer any questions if you have any.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for your succinctness. Any other member of the public who wishes to speak tonight on this case? Going once, going twice. Seeing none. We will close public comment on this case and go to Commissioner comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any Commissioner comments on this -- go ahead, Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, it looks pretty cut and dry. If my fellow colleagues have nothing to say, I would like to entertain a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I believe we're ready.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 192-2025, I move to approve the Alive in Christ Plat 2 pursuant to minor technical corrections.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on that motion? Seeing no discussion, Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Stockton, Dr. Gray. Motion carries 9-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

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

#### **VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

##### **Case Number 186-2025**

**A request by Engineering Surveys & Services on behalf of THF Grindstone Plaza Development, LLC, to rezone the western approximately seven acres of the nine-acre property from PD, Planned Development to M-C, Mixed-Use Corridor, to allow expanded commercial uses on the site. The subject site is located directly northeast of the intersection of Grindstone Parkway and Grindstone Plaza Drive and includes the address 1409 Grindstone Parkway. May we have a staff report?**

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the M-C zoning map amendment.

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, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I have a question about the traffic impact study. Do you know if there is, like, how once it's done, is there, like, an expiration on how long it's, like, valid or you would have to get a new one?

MR. KUNZ: Yeah. So I guess the validity of it is determined by a traffic engineer internally with the City, and it would be based off of what existing volumes are on Grindstone and whether or not that's consistent enough with what was considered in 2018. He determined that it would be. If they do deviate in terms of intensity of what was proposed in the 2018 or what was considered in the 2018 TIS, then they would have to come back with a new TIS, but that would mean they are intending to build greater than 18,000 square feet of retail and 15,000 to restaurant, unless I'm getting that reversed, but, yeah.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any members of the public wish to comment on this case, please come forward, state your name and address for the record, and we'll do six minutes for the applicant and a group, and three minutes for everyone else -- for individuals.

MR. FUEMMELER: Chad -- excuse me. Chad Fuemmeler, I'm with Engineering Surveys & Services, 1113 Fay Street. We are representing THF Grindstone Plaza Development, LLC, for the zoning map amendment request to PD from M-C. And could I get the presentation?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, sorry. Is there a PowerPoint? They have to switch it in the back.

MR. FUEMMELER: No worries. I should have looked up. It would help.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You should be good to go.

MS. FUEMMELER: All right. Thank you. So per the staff report, we -- the recommendation, we have a quote, "A rezoning action would promote a more efficient and predictable development process for any future user of the site and reduce regulatory impediments". I felt it was really important because our initial concept and reason why we were going to do this, it aligns with the purpose of aligning zoning with the existing use, simplifying the development process and reducing the administrative burden not only for the City, but for the developer as well. This graphic here illustrates a little overview of the property. It is generally a rectangular plot of one -- one parcel, excuse me, of seven acres, eleven hundred feet long by approximately 300 feet in depth. The topography gently slopes from east to west, and it is currently part of the existing regional storm water detention basin. This set of graphics here really just is -- is set to show the development over time. The -- the graphic to the left from August of 2025, we can see that things are just starting to get going with East Green Meadows under construction, clearing going on for Walmart and Kohl's, and also construction started for The Crossing. The middle graphic illustrates how this is coming quite a ways in just six years with the development of Walmart and -- and East Green Meadows Road, and then also the first phase of The Crossing. And then the PD

lots Number 5 are getting the clearing going. And then on the final, in March of 2025, because, yeah, everything has been built out. And I think what's really important to point out here is that the -- the uses that are -- that have come along within this PD zoning have really aligned themselves with what is already naturally M-C. And so what we're trying to do here is create that commercial corridor that the staff had reported on earlier. The next graphic here is really just to show that again. This exhibit illustrates in more details the zoning context, and fits the -- and the Grindstone Plaza Lot 3 fits this zoning because the original PD is outdated or no longer consistent with the development goals, and that was shown in the previous slide. The existing and planned uses aligned better with M-C standards than currently with the PD, and the M-C designation reduces the need for frequent amendments and variances. This -- or this really puts some consistency with the planning goals. It does not deviate from the current land-use plan. The M-C zoning supports economic development corridors, enhances redevelopment potential, and streamlines the entitlement process. The plan below or that's on your screen is one of many, as the staff report had shown, they had a different plan. This is another evolution. But what we're really trying to illustrate here is that the concepts have changed, but the land uses have remained the same. Square footages of 18,000 and 15,000 respectively for restaurant and retail, those things all remain the same, so we're not changing what's going on there, we're just adjusting the footprints. And what we're trying to do is make sure that we're not having to come to P & Z there is a slight adjustment. And then to touch briefly on the -- on the proposed traffic improvements, the staff report outlines that perfectly in that whatever was recommended from that traffic study is still relevant because the development has not modified in what its uses are going to be, but it is -- but the -- the developer is -- they are going to go ahead and make those improvements per the impact study, which would be signal improvements and then adding the turn lanes. And, in summary, we would just like to make the zoning change request from PD to M-C. We feel that this is rational because it is consistent with the current surrounding zoning. It is compatible with nearby developments. There is general support from the City staff, and it does support the long-term economic development goals. We respectfully request the approval of the zoning map amendment. We remain committed to working closely with City staff and stakeholders, and we also remain committed to quality development in alignment with the City goals. Thank you all very much for your time, and I'd like to open it up if anybody has any questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing -- oh. Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: Have you or the owners had any conversations with the neighbor to the north?

MR. FUEMMELER: Not that I'm aware of. I know that there was, per the report, there were -- had issued the notices and things, but I don't think we had any feedback.

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

MR. FUEMMELER: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further member of the public to speak on this case tonight, please come forward. Come on.

MS. PRITCHARD: Good evening. My name is Jan Pritchard; I live at 3505 Rock Quarry Road, and if you look at your little map, you can see my house. It's the big lot that's just south of Sun Court. I've lived in this house for over 30 years, and I have been deeply involved in just about every planning that has happened along Rock Quarry Road. I was instrumental in helping draft the overlay district getting Rockway Park, and actually I was in on all the original discussions on this particular development. I am actually -- I am ambivalent about this. I certainly understand why he wants to change the zoning, because it is very, very complicated. I even helped on some of the committees to rewrite the commercial zoning. But I do want to point a couple of things out. When this particular plat was done, the -- the thinking was that this section, of course, we had the part along Rock Quarry Road, and that was to keep Rock Quarry, you know, the scenic road, and that's on the overlay. And then the big part with Walmart and everything, it was -- it was a PD, so they could actually have more extensive use on Walmart. They've done a terrific job on that development, and it looks great. This particular -- at the time, this particular lot or section was going to be sort of a transitional section between all the residential on the west and the heavy commercial on the right. Times change, I understand that. But I -- I just want to point out that there really isn't -- with this -- with the exception of this commercial piece of property, there is nothing commercial along Grindstone between Grindstone Plaza Drive and Rock Quarry Road. And Rock Quarry Road is all residential. Surrounding this property, you have two churches, you have residential property, you have a lot of agricultural property, and, you know. So anyway, something to keep in mind when, as this develops and -- and his plan looks great. I don't have a problem with that. The other thing is a traffic issue on Rock Quarry Road. It is a very, very dangerous intersection. There are at least half a dozen serious injuries on that road on that -- at that intersection every year. People get killed on that road, and many people get killed at that intersection. So whatever develops in that area, I am concerned that if it's going to be a heavy traffic development, it's going to be even worse for Rock Quarry Road. But, okay, those are my observations, one that I would rather see a more transitional, you know, less intensive commercial use than is to the west, and keep an eye on the traffic issues.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you so much for being here tonight. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MS. PRITCHARD: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Appreciate the history. Anyone else to speak on this case, 1409 Grindstone Parkway? Last call. Seeing none. We will close public hearing on this case and go to Commissioner comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

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

Stanton? Yes. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I think it was a pretty thorough staff report, pretty technically sound. If my fellow Commissioners don't have any more questions or comments, I would like to entertain a motion. As it relates to Case 186-2025, 1409 Grindstone Parkway rezoning, I move to approve the request to rezone the site from PD to M-C.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

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

MR. BRODSKY: Motion carries 9-0.

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

**Case Number 187-2025**

**A request by Luebbert Engineering (agent), on behalf of Woodstock MH, LLC (owner) seeking approval of R-MH (Residential Manufactured Home) permanent zoning upon annexation. The subject site is presently improved with the Woodstock Mobile Home Park. The requested permanent zoning and concurrent annexation would permit the park to be fully connected to public sewer service. The 36.65-acres subject site is located northwest of the intersection of Warren Drive and New Haven Road, and is zoned Boone County R-M (Moderate Density Residential), and is commonly addressed as 3501 New Haven Road.**

MS. GEUEA JONES: I will remind everyone that we only speak to the zoning, we do not make any determination or recommendation on annexation. May we please have a staff report?

MR. PALMER: We will actually pause for just a moment until Mr. Zenner returns.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. PALMER: He's actually the case manager for this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Who is the case manager on 195? Is that also Mr. Zenner?

MR. PALMER: That's me, actually.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Without objection, would any of my fellow Commissioners mind if we switched the order of those two cases? Okay, then. Without objection, we will switch that order so that Mr. Zenner -- oh, no. He's coming. Okay.

MR. STANTON: Flying in the door.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I know he was working on something for one of our later cases, so I didn't want to interrupt him.



MR. ZENNER: My apologies. Thank you for holding the meeting. All right.

Staff report given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends the following with respect to this request:

1. Approval of the proposed R-MH district designation subject to Council approval of the concurrent annexation request; and
2. Approval of the submitted R-MH Park Plan inclusive of the design exceptions shown thereon, subject to minor technical corrections.

MS. GEUEA JONES: 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, please disclose so now. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Yes. I have a lot of professional colleagues that lived in this -- lived in this -- live in this park, as well as some family and friends. They may speak this evening, but if you know me, I -- it will not waiver my opinion or decisions that I make concerning this case.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you for your disclosure. Anyone else? Seeing none. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Mr. Zenner, so changing to R-MH, does it provide any additional protections or standards to the existing park -- bring special requirements or ramp requirements or improvements to the internal --

MR. ZENNER: So aside from being required to go through the proper closure process for the on-site waste treatment facilities, which would be a DNR closure procedure, and then constructing private sanitary sewer services for the portion of the park that presently needs to be connected up to get to the public sewer, you will have a water line extension that comes off of the 16-inch water main that is along the northern boundary of New Haven Drive, and that is essential in order to provide City fire flow levels in order to be able to be able to do fire suppression. This being part of the City will open up the requirements then that particular environmental and other maintenance code requirements will need to be also complied with. So in the plan review, we did identify -- our City arborist had identified many dangerous and dead structures or trees within the park that do need to be addressed, and that would then become -- we would have a mechanism through being inside the City to be able to facilitate that. Maintenance of the park's internal roadway network, because it is all private streets, that is at the applicant's responsibility, the applicant developer's responsibility, and we do have a representative of the ownership group here this evening with the engineer, to potentially answer in greater detail what plans they have. With the platting action, again, we will have exterior sidewalks will need to be added to both New Haven and to Warren Drive. That is going to come through as a part of the platting action, and there will likely be a development agreement that will be negotiated between the City Council and the applicant developer in order to determine timing of when those particular improvements will be necessary. Proximity to the school obviously allows for interconnectivity for any children that are here to get to the

school to New Haven. Improvements to the internal park circulation would be valuable. Those are questions and concerns that have been raised by graphics that were provided to you from a resident within the community in front of your seats this evening, and I believe the owners can speak to that, as well. But we do have some tools that because of it being inside the City, we will be able to have a little bit more oversight in some operational related matters.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. That's great, because those roads inside that trailer park is like driving down Bagdad after B-52 strike. There's craters that need four-by-four action to drive through, so I'll -- that's very good to hear that there will be mechanisms that the owner will have -- well, the residents will have to improve some of those conditions inside that park, because affordable housing, this is a tool in our toolbox, and good to hear. Thank you, sir.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any members of the public who wish to come forward, please do so. State your name and address for the record.

MS. LUEBBERT: My name is Christina Luebbert with Luebbert Engineering, offices at 409 Vandiver. This has been a long time coming. It's been on my plate for many years with the previous owner. The new owner contacted me a little while back, and I said do you know what you've gotten yourself into. They were preparing to make about a half-million dollars of improvements to said roads that look like they need improvements. When I told them not to because we were going to tear them up to build water and sewer. And -- but we can't build water and sewer until we have a legal lot, which has to be platted, and we can't have a plat until we annex and get permanent zoning. So this is one of many steps that I am prepared to take between now and probably the end of this year to get this approved and moving forward with making those improvements. We actually went to the City Council right at about a year ago to ask about the necessity of annexation because when you pulled that thread, all these other things unraveled, and they insisted that that was their policy and that they would not make an exception for this. This took many weeks of surveying every single home out there so that we could document its location. We also documented the location of some sheds that are on the perimeter, but we decided to not document every single porch and shed, and just instead made kind of a blanket statement that they will remain as they are until such a time that they're ever taken down or removed, and then they would have to be built back more compliant. Once we had the location of the homes, I attempted to create a lot layout or a pad site layout because these are not lots under the legal definition -- a pad site layout that was as compliant as possible. I started with side setbacks and tried to strike locations of those lines in a way that made them as -- meet the dimensional standards as close as possible, and then I spent three weeks developing the spreadsheet on page 6 to really analyze where we were close to being compliant, where we were not compliant at all, and trying to come up with the best solution. And Pat has been very

helpful in getting this pulled together. And I would encourage you to read a lot of the notes. There's one whole section that explains when this lot has to be eliminated, this is where it's going, this one is eliminated, this is where it's going, and with the treatment plant lot giving me a fudge factor that if somebody is trying to move a home in that doesn't fit on an existing lot, we can eliminate the existing lot and trade it out for that, but to keep that 208 families having a place to live that is reasonably affordable, because not only did Columbia Regency get eliminated, the one south of Lenore got eliminated many years ago, as well. So there's -- there's not very many places where you can find -- you can find a decent place to live that's not super expensive. But we will be putting together a final plat to create one legal lot. That will trigger significant tree inventory, water line, fire hydrant plans, sanitary sewer pump stations to take the influent to the package plants and put it into the City sewer. That's actually shown on this plan. The proposed force main is on the plan. The proposed water lines and fire hydrants are on the plan. The proposed sidewalks are on the plan. And that represents \$2.1 million being sunk into this park, and that's before we pave the roads, so we're probably looking at more like \$2.6 million being poured into this park by these owners, who unlike the previous owner who just walked away from it, have, you know, raised the money to try to get this compliant with both the DNR regulations and the City regulations to the maximum extent practicable. So happy to answer questions, and I do -- I know they're aware that there's trees that need to be removed and that will be an ongoing part of the process. It just takes time to get those things lined up and the arborist just notified us of the need to do that about three or four weeks ago, so we researched a little bit.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Are there any questions for this speaker? I have one. What's your occupancy level right now? Are you 100 percent occupied? It's 208?

MS. LUEBBERT: It's list -- the vacant ones are listed on the -- on the spreadsheet.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MS. LUEBBERT: It's -- it's high occupancy. I think there's only a handful that are vacant.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It looks like it. Okay.

MS. LUEBBERT: And there was, I think, four or five that had been vacant that were actually filled in the last six months or so, because we had to go back out and resurvey that five or six homes that -- to keep this plan as current as possible.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So they won't have to be relocated immediately. Right? Like, there's -- is there a lot of this you can do without relocating the residents?

MS. LUEBBERT: So -- so there's one that will be forced to be relocated when MoDOT makes the entrance go away. When they change the entrance, that one will have to be relocated on MoDOT's timetable. The reoriented ones on the south side, I would expect those to be reoriented, slash -- again, they're not being moved, they're just going to turn. That would probably happen within the next three years, maybe a little sooner. It'll just kind of depend on -- I mean, we won't probably even have a permit for everything until towards the end of this year. So, three-ish years, we're going to propose in our

development agreement to push off the Warren Drive changes until Warren Drive would be improved because there's no real reason to uproot those people if we don't have to. We'll just have to see what the Council feels about extending that time line as part of a development agreement.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think you --

MS. LUBBERT: And the development agreement goes with the plat, which is after the annexation.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. And that's really what I'm asking is, are we immediately displacing a bunch of people and, if so, is there a plan, but it sounds like there's a plan to make sure we're not.

MS. LUBBERT: The idea was to not have to come back to you to revise this plan for things that we know will happen in the future. So we tried to kind of do this is what it will look like today, this is what it will look like when MoDOT makes their changes, this is what it will look like when the New Haven sidewalk has to be built, and this is what it will look like when the Warren Drive sidewalk has to be built.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You --

MS. LUBBERT: All of those things will be on different time lines.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You definitely have put a lot of time and effort into it. I appreciate it.

MS. LUBBERT: That's an understatement.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else, questions for this speaker? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm -- I'm excited about the rezoning. I'm excited about it being annexed, if possible. I have a nagging worry that maybe you could -- I want it on the record so it's -- so it's known. I've been all through that mobile home park, and there are a lot of good families there. There's a lot of good connections there. Like I said, the roads -- I have a four-by-four truck, and I hardly like driving it in there. There's dead trees on lots that, you know, and these are mobile homes. Good storm, these trees coming down, what -- what happens with the residents then? You know, so I'm really worried about we're giving -- we give you this zoning, which, you know, of course there's ifs, ifs, ifs, ifs. But I definitely want to make sure that the owner doesn't forget about the residents and -- and the improvements that need to happen to -- to allow these people to still live, you know, in a mobile home.

MS. LUBBERT: Absolutely.

MR. STANTON: And attract new mobile homes, if possible.

MS. LUBBERT: Yeah. Absolutely. I do have one of our ownership group representatives here, so he can maybe talk a little more to that. But I know, like I said, they were prepared to spend a lot of money on it, and I said I don't want to have to cut your brand-new roads to put water and sewer in this park, so just hold tight while we get some of this figured out first. It wasn't them not wanting to spend the money on the park is what I'm trying to say.

MR. STANTON: Yeah.

MR. LUBBERT: They -- they definitely want to improve -- make improvements and add some amenities and make it a nice place to live. So I -- I think it's just going to take some time while we're

jumping through all the City's hoops, and then -- and then construction takes time. So I -- I hope that they can be patient while we're trying to do that, but I can understand if you're driving it every day, it's very frustrating.

MR. STANTON: Or a tree fall down on my mobile home.

MS. LUEBBERT: Well, and like I said, we -- we were just notified that we really needed to -- and the other owners don't live here, so they -- they are -- you know, that is -- they bought this as a package of, like, 45 parks, so this is one that's become a thorn in their side and they're trying to get it taken care of. And like I said, the previous owner just walked away from it.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

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

MS. SMITH: Hello. Can you hear me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: A little bit closer, maybe pull it down.

MS. SMITH: How about now?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. That's better.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Excellent. Hello. My name is Sherrece Smith, and I live at Woodstock. And I just appreciate the information that we just found out about. There has been a lack of communication here. These trees are -- these trees, if you can imagine a mobile home being about 70 feet long, and you're looking at dead tree that is at least as long as your home and is dangling there. Now I believe that there can be some solutions to temporary road things. I -- I have no problems with that. And hopefully I'll be able to discuss that, like, maybe some gravel in these deep holes and ruts in the roads. So I understand now better about what it's going to take for the sewer. I don't have an opinion on that. I'm just literally soaking all of this information in and what the implications are for me and my neighbors. A lot of my neighbors are on fixed incomes. There are those of us who have small businesses, there are those of us who work. There are those of us who are stay-at-home parents. I don't know how I can report back to my neighbors and say wait three years, you'll be safe then. I personally was told to cut down the tree because there was no contract. Once again, I'm understanding why there isn't a contract. I've asked if there was some way of sharing a contract or maybe we can chip in, something -- something. I could not sleep anymore. The trees in my neighbors' yards were crashing down on their homes and there was no solution. There was no solution with the County. The City said, hey, if you were just part of us. I really don't know what to do. Moving is seeming like a pretty good solution about right now given this time line. I appreciate this owner really stepping up and trying to improve this park and make it the best park that it is. I remember when it was a great park. I remember when it truly was a community and the trees were just in a better condition. Years have passed and they are deteriorating, and as well, apparently, as the sewer and all the other infrastructure. So there's multiple infrastructure challenges going on here. Three-year turnaround, okay. Trees, I don't see three

years.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Please, if you could hold on just a moment. Are there any questions? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Just a simple question. Does the neighborhood that you and the neighbors have any means of communicating with one another via the -- like a Facebook page or some other platform that you can share information?

MS. SMITH: I personally don't have a Facebook. I'm told that there is a Facebook account. We also have a language barrier, so we are a multi-lingual neighborhood. We used to have a neighborhood group that used to meet at the school, but that was years and years ago, that I recall, so --

MR. WALTERS: Yeah. I was just hoping that maybe the developer or developers' representatives communicate with you as a group.

MS. SMITH: I -- I guess they could go through our tenant system that they have us set up an account through there.

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MS. SMITH: I was hoping to get maybe some kind of notes that way. There is a text system that they have. If your -- if your phone system is -- a phone number is part of that, then you will get a message from the manager. Not once have I really heard any messages dealing with this or really the reasons why we're hanging out there about the tree situation because I think some of us would have took alternative actions that would have really helped us with our decision-making, like renewing our tenant lease agreements. And please, I understand that this is reasonable affordable housing, but I feel like mobile home tenants are a little different. We own our floors, our walls. We own our roof. We just need to be hooked up somewhere. To move these homes, we are looking at \$5,000 to \$10,000 to move, if you're able to move your home. So then you're faced with do I sell it. And as I'm talking, I am a little concerned of what those applications are after what I'm hearing about the infrastructure. So, you know, there's a lot for us to kind of digest and find out, figure out what -- what we can do. But there are -- they're being -- they're veterans. They are disabled people. They are retired people. You know, we have a good mix of -- of a community there.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Can you voice all of your concerns, and as my other colleagues asked if there's some kind of line of communication, what's the relationship between you and the owners? Is there -- do you -- can you identify the owner? Do you have a name? Do you have a corporation that you can address? Do you have a manager that is responsive? Do you have a management group? Is this how -- it seems like when you're talking, you're talking like you guys are out on an island, and there's no one that is clearly responding to the tree issue, to the B-52 strikes, to the -- who is the corporation, who is the person who is the registered agent for this company? Who is the physical human person that you

can get ahold of to voice your opinions and get a quick response?

MS. SMITH: We have a park manager.

MR. STANTON: And that works? He responds? Talk to me. I mean, is -- is that working?  
Is that --

MR. SMITH: I mean, look, there's 208 lots. Right? And there's probably about two of us here, so, you know, it's -- it's your home. I mean, I am concerned about talking about that.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Darr, you were next, and then Commissioner Ortiz.

MR. DARR: Have you experienced any parking problems?

MS. SMITH: Yes.

MR. DARR: Like not enough parking or people parking in the wrong spot or --

MS. SMITH: Are you talking about, like, parking cars or something?

MR. DARR: Parking cars, availability for -- yeah, to park your vehicle?

MS. SMITH: I mean, I personally called in -- I feel like we don't pay rent, we pay housing association fees. And with that, we have housing association rules. Very strict. We don't park on the side of the sidewalk. That's against the rules. You must be parked within the parking lot. And I get it. I mean, there's certain rules, but --

MR. DARR: But there's adequate parking for you or --

MS. SMITH: For me, yes.

MR. DARR: I mean, for your family?

MS. SMITH: For others, I mean, they're -- they're doing what they can within the confines of whatever that -- that solution is for that moment.

MR. DARR: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I want to thank you for being here and giving, like, context on -- on your experience because I don't have a lot of experience in this area, so I really appreciate you giving it. I did have a question. I guess I like multi-part, but do you know if your park manager stays the same throughout ownership changes, or if that's something --

MS. SMITH: Uh-huh. Yes.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MS. SMITH: Yes. She's managed to stay.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Did you know that there's reviews on line talking about dangerous trees dating back to 2016 that talk about the park manager who did nothing about it?

MS. SMITH: I -- I can honestly say I don't have a social media presence, but the tree that I cut down is -- it was an ash tree, so that right there. If anybody knows about ash trees --

MS. ORTIZ: Evidence of disease or --

MS. SMITH: Yes. In fact, I believe I might have submitted a photo of that to Mr. Zenner, the one with the ziggy -- and the bark separating. That's not -- that's not an exception. There are dozens upon dozens upon dozens of dead trees, and now there's some trees that look alive that have recently fallen. I have submitted pictures of that, too.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Commissioner Stanton? Or not Stanton, sorry. Stockton.

MS. STOCKTON: Yeah. Stockton. I'm new. I just wanted to thank you for coming. That was my -- going to be my question as to how informed the residents are of these changes that are coming, and I hope we can move it along a little faster for you.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I had a couple of questions. It -- it sounds like you didn't get any real communication other than maybe the notice from the City that all of this was happening; is that a correct statement?

MS. SMITH: There is a sign. It's in part of my photo of the entrance. It's kind of folded down. People notice that note -- that note is -- I notice that it was really big, but once again, I wasn't really looking that way because I'm too busy trying to not mess up the front of my vehicle as I'm trying to enter the park. That was me personally, though, but --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I find that a little concerning, which is why I want to be really clear that you, as the owner of your home, who rents this space, were not contacted by the owners of the land to let you know what their plans were?

MS. SMITH: Well, I guess, in our case, it would be the park manager, because I don't know who the owner is, except that they're somewhere in Texas. But, I mean, I found out through neighbors and whatnot. They were, like, oh, yeah, there's a notice, and I was, like, oh, where? It took me a minute to figure it out, but -- but I think it's because, at that time, the plastic kind of folded down a little bit and I -- you know, maneuvered my car just enough where I could kind of see the sign as I was trying to miss the huge gaps, but, you know, that's just me. I mean, there might be other people that -- I mean, that's all I can tell you. I don't know about any other notices, and honestly, we -- I think a lot of us don't really read the newspapers. We -- there's people who have Facebook. I listen to, like, the radio quite a bit. I, you know, stream. I see, you know, local commercials that way or whatever. I can't really speak for anyone else, but if it's not in Spanish as well, that might be a barrier.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. I'm sorry. I'm not trying to get you in a -- I'm not trying to catch you off guard or anything. I'm just really concerned because that seems unusual and -- and doesn't take into account the fact that you are their customer. So that -- that's why I just want to be very clear that I'm not missing something. They didn't send you a letter? Okay.

MS. SMITH: Yeah. No, I don't see any letters. And if they sent an e-mail, I haven't heard



anyone say anything about an e-mail. And unfortunately, my neighbors for whatever reason just couldn't --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure. Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much. Any further questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Is there anyone else to speak on this case? Please come forward.

MR. WEST: My name is Christian West, and I'm with Woodstock MHLC, and then Oakwood Properties. Just to answer your all's questions on the trees, the roads, I'm actually the project manager for this community and this region. Started it about two months ago, so we're obviously behind the eight ball. And that's my job here this week, walking the property and seeing all what we need to do. Obviously, a tree where storms coming through obviously needs to be done, and that's what I'm going to try to take care of in the next two to three weeks. I already have bids lining up. We have national tree companies and local that I've been in contact with, and I want to say two to three weeks, we should be able to get a lot done. And then for the roads, obviously with the sewer, water lines, we can only do so much, but to answer your all's questions about can we fill the potholes, can we cold patch, can we do some smaller things, 100 percent. That's not even a problem. And we have budgets placed in that from quarter of a million dollars to half a million dollars, and that's probably going to be a lot more than that when all these roads get torn up. And so we have really good plans on doing that. Roads time frame, obviously it's not ideal, but we do plan on really doing some work to those roads because, I mean, I can't even drive on them. So to answer those questions, those trees will be taken care of. I guarantee that.

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

MR. STANTON: So are you available to the residents -- basically homeowners that have homes there?

MR. WEST: I -- not necessarily -- not necessarily myself.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. WEST: Being based out of Dallas, I have a region of Illinois, Florida, and Missouri, between 25 properties, some spread out, but I travel, shoot, three weeks out of the month to help these communities.

MR. STANTON: Can you help -- I guess what I'm getting at, can you help the residents find a physical body to talk to and address their issues?

MR. WEST: Well, 100 percent. So our property manager, ideally, obviously, you know from the comments, that it's not working. But we also have above her is the regional manager, she runs all of our Missouri properties within St. Louis, St. Charles, and then down into Columbia at Woodstock, and she's her higher up, and she's directly involved with a lot of that, and I can definitely get word back to our front office that it's not working.

MR. STANTON: Well, tonight -- people that are in this meeting tonight.

MR. WEST: I'm sorry?

MR. STANTON: Or to the people that are in this meeting tonight.

MR. WEST: What was that? I'm sorry.

MR. STANTON: The people that are in this meeting tonight that are here, that would maybe be a good idea.

MR. WEST: Yeah. Definitely. And -- and to kind of give you a little bit of my background, I was the regional manager for two and a half, three years before I got into the project management side, so I directly dealt with tenants day in and day out for probably about two years. And so -- and I get it. I see their frustrations and usually, as the project manager now, when we purchase these properties from these mom and pop, they don't take care of them or they just leave them and they go run away when we purchase them. Ideally, I like to get the roads done in one month, if not less time. Tree work, amenities, playgrounds, industrial playgrounds where they're not going to break apart if someone jumps on it and vandalize. They -- we want to do, like, higher-end things so we don't have to keep coming back and doing it, and that's -- that's our goal. We have budgets to do it, and again, I've only been in this position for about two months for this community, but I guarantee you that you are going to see some changes very quickly.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I forgot to stop the time, and you didn't use your whole three minutes. Anything else, Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: No.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I -- I would like to know -- so you -- you work for the owners. You do the maintenance or the project the redevelopment, whatever --

MR. WEST: Projects, infrastructure -- and I'm a little behind the eight ball on this project, exactly. I'm learning as I go, to a point --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. WEST: -- but roads, trees, anything like -- along those lines.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Why no notice to the residents?

MR. WEST: And to be honest with you, I cannot answer that --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. WEST: -- because that was a surprise to me, also.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Okay.

MR. WEST: But I can definitely make sure that that has happened. My assumption is that we wanted to make sure it was actually going to happen before we maybe scared people. That's my guess. They might lose their home, or if they're going to have to move places, you don't want to cause a fire if there -- you know, if there isn't going to be one. That's my assumption. But that's -- that's my answer for that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. It could have backfired. Any further questions for this person? Seeing none. Thank you very much for traveling here tonight. Anyone else to speak on this case?

Seeing none. We close public comment and go to Commissioner comments.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments on this case?

MR. WALTERS: I --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: You know, I'm a little confused about our role tonight. As poorly as this mobile home park is apparently being managed, is that -- that shouldn't -- is that an issue for us to worry about tonight? We're talking about annexation.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So we're not talking about annexation.

MR. WALTERS: Well, I mean, we're talking about zoning.

MR. STANTON: Zoning.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. We were talking about approving the park plan.

MR. WALTERS: Yeah. So --

MS. GEUEA JONES: And part of the park plan is the tree maintenance issue.

MR. WALTERS: Oh, it is?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. WALTERS: I thought we were just -- okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, it's on -- it's on the paperwork. Like, the paperwork talks about the roads, it talks about the orientation. It talks about everything else. So I -- I don't think things like the notice are within our purview. It's just a point of interest. But anything that goes on this park plan is part of our purview, and that includes all of the notes that are on there about the orientation, about the lots.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. And just to clarify, I'm not being insensitive. I think there's due criticism here, but I just wanted to know about --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. WALTERS: I mean, because I think the -- if they follow through with these improvements, this is going to be -- it's tremendous. I mean, if they really spend \$3 million to fix that, that's a big deal. But there's a little bit of credibility at question here, you know, whether that will really happen. But anyway. Okay. Thank you. That's it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead, Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: To address my -- my fellow Commissioner, yes. We're talking about the rezoning, but it's like any other case that we run into where we're -- we're making sure before we give you this ticket that you're going to be responsible and that, you know, I want these things on record. I want the owners to say it on record. Hey, when you get this R-MH, that, you know, there is protection. That's why I asked Mr. Zenner, when you get the zoning and you may get the annexation, does this provide additional protections to a place that I know personally has deficiencies. So that's why I'm bringing it up. Yes, you're right. This has -- none of that has something to do it, other than I want it on record, I want

people's voice on public record saying that, yes, if we grant you the zoning, that you are aware, as you know we are aware, and that the citizens that are out here that testified are aware that there are provisions and responsibilities that you have with said zoning: buffering, improvements to infrastructure, all of that. So that's why this discussion was had, at least from my point of view.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And when they bring in -- when they get annexed and when they do their final plat, they also have to do a significant tree designation. They also have to do a runoff study. They also have to do, like, storm water study. They have to do all these things as part of it. So while it's not the management, it is the land management that we're concerned with and what goes on the -- on the site plan, which is the site plan -- I'm looking at staff now, for the record. Is the site plan more of a PD or more of a plat?

MR. ZENNER: It's a little bit of both. I mean, because the criterion -- the criterion that are within the standard specifications for an R-MH district are very similar to those that we would have for a PD. There is some variability, there is some room for relaxation of the underlying standards to conform what's there. It -- and as a PD plan serves as a preliminary plat, so too does the R-MH plan. So it is a preliminary plat indicating that basically we have got proposed layouts for the utility infrastructure shown on it. We have the layout of the development and its dimensional criteria like we would for a planned district plan. So it's a little bit of both. I think as you have -- as you touched on in your comments, the final platting process of this, in order to obtain a legal lot, is going to trigger a series of other compliance related issues; the tree compliance, the storm water, the utility compliance, all of that becomes part of the review of the actual construction plans that are a prerequisite to final platting. The final platting process will not come back to this body, because the PD plan or the R-MH plan is serving as the preliminary. So as long as the boundary of this development comes back the same on the final, and it meets that all of the other infrastructure requirements that would be necessary to approve the final plat, the final plat is a technical item. Maintenance of the features within the park that we have control over, i.e., the trees specifically, that is something then that we, once it is inside the City, we have the ability to then work more directly to facilitate getting that corrected if it is not done sooner.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there other Commissioner comments? I would just say that until I found out that there had been no communication with the residents, I was pretty comfortable with all of this. That gives me significant pause that they are going to take care of some of this stuff in a quick way, very specifically, trees as we are in the middle of tornado season, so I don't know about anybody else, and if legal tells me to not do this, I'll not do this, but I would be interested in adding a criteria that they take care of that expeditiously upon annexation by the City. And I'm looking at legal now.

MR. CRAIG: As a condition for approval; is that -- well --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval of the park plan, not the zoning.

MR. CRAIG: I mean, it's kind of sticky, because, generally the condition -- you can't tack a

condition on to straight or open zoning, so -- but the plan itself, I don't know that we can -- I don't know that we have authority to -- to make that a condition of approval of the zoning itself.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Of the plan?

MR. CRAIG: I don't think so.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CRAIG: I don't think so, no.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, then let me ask this question of staff. What -- what is the time line for City enforcement upon annexation of tree stuff? If we have a very conscientious resident who calls.

MR. ZENNER: The arborist, as Ms. Luebbert indicated, had contacted -- had contacted them -- or the comment was made through the review of the plan. So it is a known quantity that we have an issue. The question that was asked of me is the tree removal -- should the tree removal be a condition of the annexation. Again, this is -- and this is where I don't want to step on Mr. Craig's conclusion because I would agree, I think we have a -- it's a real sticky situation because we don't have a "plan district." We have a development plan that's part of the zoning, and therefore, this is considered akin to a straight zone even though there's a plan. And even though I have provided to you that the ability to be able to acknowledge the non-conformities that the plan represents are akin basically to design exceptions. But the plan represents what the park is today. And, you know, we bring a plan forward and it identifies not unlike any other annexation property that we bring in that's maybe developed in the County, we bring it in warts and all. So it may be fully non-compliant, but we accept that property the way it is. I think to the point that Ms. Luebbert has made and one of the underlying principles with the plan itself is we want to set the project up for a successful future, given the volatility that's occurring around it. Therefore the plan is coming in showing all of the alterations that need to be made. If they did nothing on the perimeter of the property, just to use this as an example, the issue of buffering -- screening and buffering on the perimeter of the property doesn't become an issue. However, we want to make sure, because there are going to be perimeter changes made as a result of the road improvements, that we're addressing those at this juncture, and that's the part of the plan, and that's what the plan is identifying. So based on the question that's asked though, to get back to the answer, the arborist is well aware of it, and the arborist asked do we need to condition the approval of the permanent zoning or the annexation on the removal of trees. This is not inside our City's jurisdiction at this point. We have no jurisdiction to require the trees to be removed. So until we have jurisdiction, we can't drop a hammer from our regulatory process. Immediately following annexation, prior to even the platting, we could require or the arborist could be notified that it's been annexed, work with the owner to get the trees removed if they haven't been before submission of final plat. Alternatively, the final plat could be withheld from Council until we have the trees removed.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Does Ms. Smith need to call again?

MR. ZENNER: Ms. Smith has been in touch with me, and so she is more than welcome to call

me. That is what my role is, and I will facilitate as best I can. I would strongly recommend that the representative from the mobile home park provide contact information for her. We will keep an eye, and I -- based on the conversation we've had this evening, I can let our arborist know as he is out and about to keep an eye on what is occurring. Again -- and I don't -- I believe the Commission understands this. The -- the value of bringing this park in through the permanent zoning and annexation process is absolutely critical. And it is the only way that the park can continue to maintain its level of compliance. And so I think the issues that we discussed this evening are correctable. They're correctable at a process that we have to be able to be in the position to where the City's regulatory structure is actually applicable. And once that occurs, I think we can take more effective and expeditious action, if necessary.

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

MR STANTON: So, Mr. Zenner, what I'm hearing is at the annexation hearing, which would be City Council, it would behoove the citizens to be there to make sure they voice their opinion concerning the trees? I'm trying to -- because you're right. This is out of our ballpark, but I'm trying to make the custody of -- of advocacy and, you know, activism to transfer to wherever it needs to be, and if we can't hold them accountable tonight, I want somebody's butt on the line somewhere. Where does that happen and when does that happen, as an activist.

MR. ZENNER: I think the concern -- yeah. I believe the concern could be expressed by the residents again at the public hearing on the annexation. This transcript, of course, is provided directly to the Council for their purview and this particular topic area and our conveyance comments will be added. This is not something that will just be buried in a set of minutes, given the significance of this concern that's been expressed not only by residents, but by the Commission. And these are one of the things that will float to the top of the Commission comments, but that it would be, I think, Mr. Stanton, is an appropriate venue. Council controls the annexation, and if Council wants to basically say we're only going to take you if you commit to X, that's probably the appropriate venue by which to have that done. Now again, a public hearing will be held on the annexation, a decision is not made. A public hearing is held. The decision is made at the meeting following that, so the public hearing is being requested to be set for July 7th, which is the first Monday of the month of July, and then July 22nd, if I am not incorrect, which is the third Monday is when final reading on not only the annexation, and this zoning request would be heard. So depending on the outcome of your vote, or you could have a supplemental recommendation that this be placed on old business so it is discussed in greater depth at the second reading, that is your choice. But it would be at second reading that probably any additional stipulations could be added by Council at that point, should they so desire to do an amended ordinance or something else along those lines.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further Commissioner comment? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: My question is on -- so you mentioned that the Council receives the minutes from

this meeting. I'm curious what triggers Council getting the minutes versus as just getting like a staff report?

MR. ZENNER: No. The -- well, it's both. They get a full staff report, and as a part of the full staff report, we have the full excerpt minutes that are specific to this case. They are always provided that. That is standard practice.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So, Commissioner Zenner, are annexations no longer put on -- sorry, Mr. Zenner. Are annexations -- sorry. My brain is already tired, and we have so much more to go. Are annexations no longer put on the consent calendar?

MR. ZENNER: So an annexation has got three parts.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right.

MR. ZENNER: Set the hearing, which will occur on the 16th of June for July 7. You hold a public hearing, and that's at the public hearing section of the Council's agenda. We introduce zoning that same meeting, so July 7, we will introduce the zoning request, they will hold a public hearing. Typically, if you have a vote more than 75 percent of the Commission votes in favor, the item, the zoning item would go on consent. The annexation would be attached to that, in essence, and they both would be considered under consent. What happens when you make a supplemental vote, like we have done, we will request that the second reading of this zoning action be placed under old business will then -- which will automatically cause the annexation to be pulled into old business, which will then trigger Council discussion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. And they do that after we've voted on our recommendation, there's then another motion made?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Any further comment, or are we ready for a motion? Would anyone like to make a motion on this case?

MR. WALTERS: I would.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: In regard to Case Number 187-2025, I move to approve the permanent zoning requested R-MH zoning subject to annexation to approve the R-MH Park Plan inclusive of the following design exceptions. Reduction of the minimum lot dimension standards for each lot within the park as shown on page 6 of the park plan, waiver of the required perimeter buffer screening and reduction in required on-site parking as calculated per Section 29-4.3 by 85 spaces.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MR. STANTON: Second.

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

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

**Motion carries 9-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Are there any other motions to be made on this case?

MS. ORTIZ: I have a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I move that this item be placed under Old Business at City Council.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second on that motion.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: A motion to move the item to Old Business on the City Council agenda has been made by Commissioner Ortiz, and seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on that motion? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Please clarify. I don't understand.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It means that they will have to vote on this as a separate item instead of being on the consent agenda.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Sounds good.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Is that something we, as a Commission, have the ability to do?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. That is what we just discussed with Mr. --

MR. CRAIG: We can request -- we can request that it be done.

MR. STANTON: Do it all the time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Oh, yes. Thank you. We will wait for Commissioner Wilson, or do we need a roll call, or can we just do it thumbs up?

MR. CRAIG: Let's wait for Commissioner Wilson.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. We'll just wait for Commissioner Wilson. As a point of information, my intention is after we take this vote to take a five-minute bio break for our Commissioners who have a very long agenda tonight, and we can't all leave the dais at once.

(Off the record)

MS. GEUEA JONES: All right. We will come back to order. We are voting on removing this item from the Consent Agenda, and placing it under Old Business. Whenever you are ready, Commissioner Brodsky, maybe we have a roll call?

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



**Motion carries 9-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries. The item will be moved to Old Business instead of Consent Agenda.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. We will now take a five-minute bathroom break. I am turning on my timer for five minutes, so we can all hear it when it goes off. We will stand in recess.

(Off the record)

MS. GEUEA JONES: We will come back to order. I think I see -- yeah. We're all here. Okay. Great. If staff is ready to proceed? Excellent. Thank you all for that.

**Case Number 195-2025**

**A request by Haden and Colbert, (agent), on behalf of JAMPAM, LLC (owner) seeking approval to rezone 25 acres from PD (Planned Development) to M-C (Mixed-use Corridor). The subject site is located southeast of the Highway 63 and N. Oakland Gravel Road interchange on the south side of Starke Avenue and is addressed 2620 Starke Avenue.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to the M-C district on the subject 25-acre parcel.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had any contact with the parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Any questions for staff? Seeing none. Thank you very much. We will go to public comments. Are there any members of the public to speak on this case?

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward. State your name and address for the record. We allow six minutes for the applicant and a group, three minutes for an individual. You do not have to take all of your time.

MR. COLBERT: Understood. Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the Commissioner, Caleb Colbert, attorney, at 827 East Broadway. I'm here tonight on behalf of the applicant to ask for your support for the M-C zoning. Given the time in the evening, Mr. Palmer covered everything in the staff report, so I just would offer to answer any questions that you may have.

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

MR. COLBERT: All right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, we've got a waive. Commissioner Stanton, go ahead.

MR. STANTON: I just have a comment. I like your efficiency.

MR. COLBERT: Yeah. I had you in mind.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Anyone else from the public to speak on this case, please come forward. Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comments.

## **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: It's pretty straightforward, technically sound. If my colleagues have no further questions, I would entertain a motion, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please do.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 195-2025, 2620 Starke Avenue rezoning, I move to approve the request to rezone the parcel from PD to M-C.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: A motion made by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on that 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. Darr, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Stockton, Dr. Gray. Motion carries 9-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That was a unanimous vote. We will forward that recommendation to City Council. Moving on to our next case.

### **Case Number 197-2025**

**A request by Hacker and Colbert (agent) on behalf of Robyn Armer (owner) for approval to rezone approximately three acres of property from PD (Planned Development) to M-C (Mixed Use - Corridor) to allow expanded commercial uses on the site. The subject site is located directly north of the intersection of East St. Charles Road and Remm Drive, and includes the address 5717 E. St. Charles Road.**

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

MR. KUNZ: Yes, you may.

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends denial of the M-C zoning map amendment. Alternatively, if believed appropriate and supported by the applicant, the Planning and Zoning Commission could recommend approval to rezone the parcel to M-N, which is consistent with the adjacent zoning, land use patterns north of St. Charles Road, and the comprehensive plan. Regardless of the chosen course of action, the aforementioned recommendations require technical corrections to the provided legal description before this matter may be introduced to City Council.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for Staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had any contact with the parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there any questions for Staff? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Yes. Regarding the buffer requirements on the northern part of this tract, are there significant differences between M-N zoning and M-C zoning regarding the buffer setback -- buffer and/or setbacks.

MR. KUNZ: I believe it is based off of the use rather than the zoning district for the -- like the screening requirements.

MR. ZENNER: For commercial -- commercial to residential will be based on the -- commercial to residential is based on the, if I'm not incorrect -- one moment. I'll get you an answer.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Any other questions for staff while we're waiting for that answer? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Have you talked to the applicant about your -- or about staff's recommendation?

MR. KUNZ: Yeah. It was communicated in the -- in the form of the -- the mark-up summary for the review for this, I mean, as well as with the published agenda here. Yeah.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else, or I guess my follow-up to that would be and they said no?

MR. KUNZ: I mean, yeah. There was not a change in recommendation following the first round of resubmit.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Mr. Zenner, do you have an answer?

MR. ZENNER: I do. So if we are talking about buffering, we evaluate that based upon the applicant's use of the property and then the adjacent zoning. So if we're multi-family on the adjacent zoning, single and two-family, and you're doing commercial development, there -- that -- the buffering would be a level three buffer which is an eight-foot-tall screening device and a ten-foot landscape strip.

MR. WALTERS: Regardless of whether it's M-N or M-C?

MR. ZENNER: Correct. It would be -- it's based upon the land use adjoining.

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: So it's -- if the property that you're buffering from is residential and your use is commercial, it -- it's commercial in general. No district designation.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions? Yes, Mr. Craig?

MR. CRAIG: There's a note from -- for legal here. Pursuant to UDC 6.4(n)(c), this Commission came out, entertain zoning requests in the alternative. It's going to require -- so it would -- it would require re-noticing for M-N. So --

MS. GEUEA JONES: And is that the case even if the applicant consents?

MR. CRAIG: Yeah. There needs to be -- there needs to be re-notice. So we -- we -- if this Commission chooses to deny the M-C, then it will have to be re-noticed as M-N and re-heard.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If we deny, that creates a delay.

MR. CRAIG: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But if we table and they re-notice and re-submit as M-N, there is still a delay, but less? Because if we deny it, is there a pause on re-submission?

MR. ZENNER: So the way that the standard reads, Ms. Chairman, is that if they withdraw after a recommendation of denial, and then resubmit within 12 months with the same request, it cannot come back for a year. If they were to submit an M-N request, which isn't the same, they would be able to immediately turn around on the next application cycle.

MR. CRAIG: Correct.

MR. ZENNER: It is probably from a practical perspective it's if the direction of the Planning Commissioner is going to be telegraphed that we're going to recommend denial of your M-C, maybe you want to consider tabling, and ask us to re-advertise, that's going to be at least a two-week delay to get the advertising out and given where we're at in the month in June, with Juneteenth being a holiday, we would not be able to place this on -- and the earliest agenda would be July 10, and we still have not come upon our advertising deadline for that meeting yet.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If we recommend denial, can they amend their request between us and City Council?

MR. CRAIG: It would still have to be re-noticed and re-heard.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Re-heard here or just --

MR. CRAIG: Here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Okay. Commissioner Brodsky, yes?

MR. BRODSKY: I might just point out that we already have a very healthy agenda on the first meeting in July, so we might -- might not want to put another item on that agenda.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It would likely not be that meeting, it sounds like.

MR. BRODSKY: Well if we table.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Yeah. Any other questions for staff? Okay. In that case, we will go to public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any members of the public wishing to come forward, please do so quickly.

MR. PEMBERTON: (Inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure. Sure. Name and address first, please.

MR. PEMBERTON: Jerry Pemberton; I'm at 1606 Lakewood Drive. There's a whole row of condos on Lakewood, and I live in one to the very rear of one of the buildings. The only thing that separates the building and my outside patio is an old row of trees that goes down, and that's the only thing that separates me from that plot of land over there. I don't know how -- from what I understood, I think they have to stay 50 feet away from that tree line, but I'm not certain about that. So right now, it's very peaceful on my patio, having my happy hour in the evening, but that could change depending on what's built over there. The other thing -- the other concern I have, and I wanted to bring up, is the -- the

amount of traffic on St. Charles Road coming from Battle High School. When the school is in session in the morning and the evening, coming down to that roundabout, that gets to be very interesting because it gets to be very difficult to get out of Lakewood Drive actually, because people don't really want to let you in, which, you know, everybody is in a hurry, you know, and they've got a McDonald's over there people want to go to now. And the other thing is there's a fire station down there on St. Charles which does typically come down and go around that roundabout a lot. So that would be another concern of mine is the traffic, you know. What -- depending on what is over there, you know. I mean, when you're that close to something, I just wanted to express my opinion, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: We appreciate you being here.

MR. PEMBERTON: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone to -- questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. COLBERT: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the Commission. Again, Caleb Colbert, attorney at 827 East Broadway, here tonight on behalf of the applicant. Let me actually address the last question about traffic. So this property would have to be platted, and depending on the type of development, would probably have to do a traffic -- traffic impact analysis and the development agreement will probably be used at some point. So there would be a study as to the traffic impacts of any development on this site. But jumping back to sort of the higher level of why we requested the M-C zoning. I think everyone is in agreement that we want to try and move away from the planned district, and if you're looking at commercial designations, there are two districts, neighborhood-commercial or corridor-commercial. And when you come out of the roundabout there at St. Charles Road, you look to the right and there is a Sonic drive-in, a very automotive oriented user. You look to the north of St. Charles Road, and there's a BP gas station, another automotive oriented user. The property to the east of the Sonic is a self-stored -- a drive-in self-storage facility, again, very automotive oriented. The user east of the self-storage facility is a car wash. I mean, that's the definition of an automotive-oriented user. I understand that car wash is now being used as a storage facility for one of the dealerships there south of St. Charles Road. But again, I guess continuing moving east, you have the M-C zoning. At the far east end of this stretch of road, you have the Boone County Fire Protection District, so you have a fire station. All of those users that have frontage on St. Charles Road are very automotive oriented. So in our mind, given the choice between the neighborhood-commercial or the corridor-commercial, St. Charles road is an arterial with car wash users, gas stations, and drive-in restaurants and appears to fit the definition of a corridor type commercial zoning. So respectfully, that's what we are asking for this evening. As far as the buffering, I think Mr. Zenner is correct that it is ultimately based on the user, and I would point out that any development on this site is going to have frontage and be required to face St. Charles Road. So when we're talking about buffering, it will be rear yard to rear yard, or side yard to rear yard. So it -- that will provide some buffering to the adjacent residential properties. I have spoken with

the residential user to the east, and she does not have any objection to this rezoning request. I spoke with one of the property owners on the south side of St. Charles Road, and they don't have any opposition to this zoning request. So we have done some outreach and at least to the immediately adjacent neighbors. Again, the one to the east is -- has a single-family residential home, and she is supportive of the request. With that being said, I would be happy to answer any questions.

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

MR. STANTON: Did you listen to the dialog between counsel and staff?

MR. COLBERT: I did.

MR. STANTON: Including M-N and -- so would you like to make a statement at this time, or are we going with the current M-C request?

MR. COLBERT: I think we would like to hear some feedback and questions from the Commissioners to get your initial thoughts, but we're certainly willing to listen to the feedback that the Commission has. I'm not trying to be difficult.

MR. STANTON: Well, I'm asking because, as you heard, we can't offer alternatives, so your recourse would be to table and then you reapply M-N, or we live or die with what you're proposing right now.

MR. COLBERT: And I think for right now, we would like to hear what your thoughts are on the M-C zoning.

MR. STANTON: I don't think if you hear that, then I think you have decided to live or die with M-C.

MR. COLBERT: I think that's fair for right now. We have other speakers that will be coming to the podium.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Did you -- I know David said you had -- or they had conversations with you about their recommendation. Did you give any feedback back or did you just wait until now to kind of present your -- your case to us?

MR. COLBERT: Well, we had -- we received these staff comments, but we did not provide any additional feedback or, you know, objection to their feedback. We appreciate their feedback. We know it's going to appear in the staff report tonight, but that was the extent of the interaction.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you. I -- I don't know what happens behind the scenes --

MR. COLBERT: Oh, sure. Yeah.

MS. ORTIZ: -- so I am genuinely curious how that works. So thank you.

MR. COLBERT: You get a little e-mail that says they've uploaded comments, and we read it and take that into consideration.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Mr. Caleb, this property was involved in the Dollar Store?

MR. COLBERT: I believe the property to the east was involved in it, yeah.

MR. STANTON: To the east. Okay. Okay. So have you talked to the residents that were affected by that property decision and the Dollar Store case?

MR. COLBERT: I have not -- I have not reached to them, and I wasn't involved in the Dollar General.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So I will just tell you that there is a huge difference between a piece of property that is going commercial that backs up to a bunch of residential, and everything on the south side. So if you want to know where I'm at right now, just speaking for myself, I'm going to be a no on M-C. And I think what Commissioner Stanton was trying to get you to do is so we don't have to call you up here later, is let us know which way you want us to go. But I -- I can't -- the whole reason we have different commercial zoning is so that we can step down to residential. And -- and this is, yes, commercial on one side, residential -- you know, M-C on one side, R-M on the other side, it screams M-N to me, just so you know where I'm at, if that informs anybody to make any other comments.

MR. COLBERT: State the feedback and I'll certainly discuss that with my client.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other -- Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Yeah. I'm looking at the assessor's website, and there appears to be a vertical strip on the west side of this property that your -- your -- do you -- does your client own this property?

MR. COLBERT: My client does not own that little strip on the west side.

MR. WALTERS: At the moment, that would create a permanent buffer for the gentleman that spoke earlier?

MR. COLBERT: That's correct. And that --

MR. WALTERS: Does anyone one know what's -- that's a strange shape, it's, what, 50 wide by 400 feet deep. Does anyone know what's --

MR. KUNZ: There was never any development plans submitted for that site. I wouldn't be able to assert necessarily what would go there.

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MR. KUNZ: It seems like it would be pretty inherently limited based off of its width, but --

MR. WALTERS: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. COLBERT: Thank you.

MR. KUNZ: Thank you.

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

MR. STANTON: Mr. Caleb, this just screams M-N to me. I'm done.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any further questions for this speaker? No? Any further comments from this speaker?

MR. WALTERS: Well --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry. Commissioner Walters, go ahead.

MR. WALTERS: I have no problem with M-C zoning.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. Any further speakers on this case, please come forward quickly. I'm looking for someone to stand up. I'm seeing none. Please come forward. Your name and address for the record, please?

MR. JOHN: My name is John John with offices at 1000 West Nifong. I know it screams M-N to you. It's -- it's on a street that, right now, is carrying more traffic than Business Loop carries and almost all of that is M-C, even when it backs up to neighborhoods. Mr. Zenner worked for five years on a -- on this UDC plan, spent probably thousands of man hours on it, probably hundreds of -- \$100,000 or more in consulting fees so that we could have buffering. I know in the UDC plan, there's 24 places where it talks about not having noise go across your property lines. The buffering depends on the uses also. So everything was put in place for a high-traffic road like this that has 17,000 cars a day on it to be an automobile-type street with automobile-type businesses on it. I understand your point, but the reason we started out on this process -- well, the CGP that's across there is the same as C-3 if you look at his -- his drawing, the gas station has been a gas station since before there was County zoning, so, you know, and actually that 50-foot strip was an easement given to the cattle farmer that had the cattle ranch back there and had no access to the road. So the current owners' grandparents gave him an easement. And so that 50-foot strip is all that's left of his property. What he's going to do with it, how he's going to use it, who knows? Having said all that or having said, I think it's probably very logical that this should be an M-C. If I don't see a lot of nods that this should be an M-C, we will ask for the tabling.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much, Mr. John. Any further speakers on this case? Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comments.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: You know, I'm just looking at lists of permitted uses compared to M-C and M-N, and I would tend to agree that M-N is more appropriate for this site given the proximity of the residential land use. And not only the uses, but also the height of the building that's permitted in M-C compared to M-N. It's 45 feet in M-C and 35 feet in M-N, so I would be -- I would be able to support this if it was M-N, but I don't think I can support it as M-C.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other Commissioner comments? Sorry. Commissioner Darr and then Commissioner Stanton.

MR. DARR: So this is a little bit of a difficult case, it seems like. I actually drive down St.



Charles Road every day right there, so it definitely feels like an automotive, like from the St. Charles when you're driving down the road, M-C zoning uses would feel right at home. Now looking from another perspective from the neighborhoods on the north and the west, yeah, you don't probably want M-C, which kind of makes you think this is kind of one of those situations where a PD zoning, where you could actually create a larger buffer, may be helpful to try to get those uses that you were trying to achieve there, but it creates a whole another host of problems, so I'm not trying to recommend we change our thought process on this. But when I really look at the details, as far as the R-M multi-family, which isn't a single-family residential zone, and there's a 50-foot strip there that is creating some kind of buffer now. I don't know if you would kind of feel obligated, the City, or Planning and Zoning, our Council would feel obligated in the future if they brought forward a plan to buy that and include that in their property. You would -- I don't know if they would feel obligated to keep it M-C or the same zoning that we decide to zone this property at. But on the north, there's really only a couple of houses on this specific property, the adjacent property that would be affected. I mean, I know if you do this one M-C, then the next one is of the two tracks there to the east would feel like they would be the same zoning to me. So I'm a little bit split on how I feel about this, but the area just seems like kind of like an M-C area to me, when I drive it. I don't know. I actually -- and I actually have lived on Dalton, which is right behind here, so I -- in the -- in the past, so I'm really familiar with this area.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Young grasshopper, you made great observations. And there was a previous case for that PD area, and it had major community activism concerning putting a Dollar Store there. So as a Commission, we have to look not for right now, but I've got to look 50 to 100 years ahead. So if I go M-C here, you're right. In a chess game, I would want to go M-C next to it. Right? That basically puts a factory in your backyard. Now right now, it's nothing. It's open space. It's a natural buffer between the St. Charles and the residents back there. M-C allows it to have an increased use in a better, you know, more intense use for that property, and it probably would encourage an M-N beside it. That is a neighborhood, if we like it or not, behind there. That buffer -- we'll create a buffer between that heavy-use St. Charles and the residents behind there, and that's what we want in zoning. So I'm very glad that the applicant requested to table this because I think that was the right decision to rethink this and --

MR. DARR: Did they request a tabling?

MR. STANTON: Yeah. Well, they --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, Mr. John said that if he's getting a lot of nos, he would rather table than deny. Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: Is tabling actually beneficial, or if we deny it, then they can just bring it right back. If we table it, I guess they wouldn't have a denial on the record, but --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, which gives them a shorter time line, tabling or a denial recommendation?

MR. ZENNER: The tabling would give them a shorter time line, because if we deny and they resubmit, they have to go back through the re-review process. That's -- we have to treat everybody equally. So if we table, we basically have the opportunity to, with proper authorization, advertise for the M-N, 15 days' worth of notice. Commission needs to decide. You have 16 items on your July 10th agenda. Do you want this to be heard on July 10th, or do you want it to be heard on July 24th? And I would imagine that the applicant would like to have this item heard sooner than late, You've heard all of the facts. The facts will not change any. The recommendation will if we're going M-N versus M-C.

MR. CRAIG: And, Madam Chair, if I may. The -- even though the applicant consents that -- that's not really the issue. It's about public notice. We can't notice for one thing and then switch it -- swap it out for something else. It's a public notice issue.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I understand, yeah.

MR. CRAIG: So, yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. That makes sense. All right. What is the will of the Commission? Would someone like to make a motion and which motion shall we make? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: One more question. Regarding the prior case, we talked about tacking on a stipulation which was not permissible. Well, if -- what if -- let's just hypothetically say we -- we approve the request, but -- or we deny the request, and then the applicant could -- the City Council, by the time they met the City Council, they could say, well, we will self-impose a setback of 50 feet or 75 feet, something along the south. Could they modify to that? Could the Council approve it, say, well, we'll approve this subject to, like, an increased setback? I know we can't do that, but can the Council do that?

MR. CRAIG: I don't believe so. I mean, we're again talking about straight zoning, so it's -- I don't believe we can --

MR. WALTERS: Okay. All right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: So I want to be clear. Are we going to make a motion to table or are we going to make a motion to live or die with M-C? What I heard the applicant say, he's open for tabling. If we vote straight what's -- if we vote for the affirmative of what's here, he lives or dies with M-C.

MS. GEUEA JONES: For the record, I am looking at the applicant and his agent, and getting thumbs ups and nods on tabling.

MS. WILSON: Question?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Is it appropriate for us to table, or are we wanting the applicant to request a tabling?

MS. GEUEA JONES: At this point, we have to make a tabling motion.

MR. ZENNER: And the applicant has -- the applicant has expressed their satisfaction that a

tabling would be what recommendation they would prefer from the Commission at this point.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Any further Commissioner comment? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: So if we table it, it's still going to need to be re-advertised?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: Oh, yes. Yes. And the staff report that you had presented to you this evening will need to be revised, actually probably shortened, given the fact that there is a lot of data that can -- is no longer relevant.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further Commissioner comment? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: If there is no further comment, I can try to make a motion. Okay. In the case Number 197-2025, 5717 East St. Charles Road, I move to table those to the July 26th --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Twenty-fourth?

MS. ORTIZ: -- 24th. I move to table this to the July 24th Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion to table made by Commissioner Ortiz, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Does everyone understand what we're doing? Nods. Great. Any discussion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

MR. BRODSKY: Motion has been made and seconded to table this item to the July 24th P & Z meeting.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Stockton, Dr. Gray. Motion carries 9-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries. We will revisit this on July 24th.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That case will be tabled to the July 24th meeting. Thank you, staff, for your assistance with the procedure. Moving on.

#### **Case Number 193-2025**

**A request by Kyle Bogner (agent), on behalf of Kyle and Bailee Bogner (owners), for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow the dwelling addressed as 411 N Brookline Drive to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of eight transient guests up to 210 nights annually pursuant to Section 29-3.3(vv) and Section 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The subject property contains approximately 0.22-acres, is located directly north and slightly west of the intersection of Danvers Drive and N Brookline Drive, is zoned R-1 (One-family dwelling), and is addressed 411 N Brookline Drive.**

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

MR. ZENNER: Before Mr. Kunz gives the staff report, I would like to let the Planning

Commission know the next four applications were all received prior to the June 1st enforcement deadline. They were actually received at the end of April. And pursuant to the way that our process operates, these cases are to be considered as though they were compliant at the time that they were submitted, and we will have a similar situation that will occur on our July 10th agenda. I will repeat the same instruction. Half of the applications for short-term rentals were then received on May 12, but because of the holiday, they will not be able to be considered until almost a month later. With that, that is just my general instruction and guidance to the Commission as it relates to these applications. It's not that the applicants have tried to avoid submitting. Mr. Kunz?

MR. KUNZ: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the CUP to allow 411 North Brookline to be operated as a STR subject to:

1. Maximum occupancy permitted within the dwelling shall not exceed 8 transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by the most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IMPC); and
2. A maximum of 210-nights of annual usage; and
3. The parking spaces within the attached 2-car garage be made available when the dwelling is in STR use.

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, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Any questions for staff? Seeing none. Thank you very much. We will go to public comment. Any members of the public here to speak on this case tonight, please come forward.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. LYBARGER: Hi, I'm Denver Lybarger, 413 North Brookline Drive, neighbor. I just wanted to say I support it. I've -- they've been doing it for a while, no issues so far. I also use Airbnbs all the time. I love the ability to do so when I travel. I think it's much more convenient than using a hotel, and I think I get a lot more enjoyment with my family when using them, so I'm in support of it.

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

MS. CONNER: My name is Brooke Conner, and I live at 406 North Brookline Drive. If you're standing at my front door and looking out, the property, the Airbnb is across the street from me and one door to the left. We've owned our home and lived in our home for 20 years. We raised our -- we've put our roots there. We've -- we're raising our four children there with our youngest being seven years old. Our neighborhood is a very family-oriented neighborhood. It has a lot of children in it. Can I approach to bring paperwork to you?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure. If you just hand it to Commissioner Darr, then he'll pass it down.

MS. CONNER: I have marked where all the children are kind of located in the neighborhood,

and a lot of North Brookline and Danvers, all the kids are back and forth between our house and, you know, each other's houses, all around. And you can see that just in that short amount of area, there's 36 children. And I have concern with what I -- what I, in my humble opinion call a glorified hotel room in the middle of my --my neighborhood. We are two and a half miles from the stadium, so it makes it a prime spot for football season, and we did have issues in the fall with a rental there. And I know that they're -- did bring a letter to the neighbors stating that they -- they tried to screen all the guests, but you can't truly screen all the guests, and one of the guests had rented -- it was a child that rented under their parents account, and had a party there. And I have some information because I did contact the police that night. Unfortunately, that's the night of the shooting at Buffalo Wild Wings, so the police didn't end up coming to my house because they were dealing with that at the same time. They were road racing in front of the house. I hit a brick wall of marijuana when I came out my door. It was in the middle of the night. Another neighbor went over and talked to the people. We've had some other issues with a lot of traffic over there. I will say over the wintertime, it has been quiet and calm. The fall, with the football season, is where we were kind of seeing a lot of traffic, a lot of people over there. And so that's a concern for me as far as, you know, what is that traffic going to be like when fall comes, we're so close to the stadium. And I'm just concerned for the safety of my children. I will tell you that I check their website regularly to see who is on the docket to -- you know, if it's rented because my children ride their bikes and they're back and forth, and I don't know who these people are that are coming and renting and staying in my neighborhood. At least if somebody was renting long term, you know, they would have to register as a sex offender if they were a sex offender. I would -- I would get to know my neighbors, but with the revolving door of in and out, it's a concern for me and for my children. And I -- I'm just sad to see a business being planted smack dab in the middle of our family neighborhood that we've been so long and with all the kids there.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. I'm right at three minutes. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: The testimony that you just gave is directly related to this address --

MS. CONNER: Yes, sir.

MR. STANTON: -- or to the neighborhood. This address that is up for --

MS. CONNER: Yes. It's right across the street from me, one door to the left if you're looking out my front door.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CONNER: I live right on the corner of Danvers and North Brookline, but my door faces North Brookline.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I noticed on the papers that you gave to us, that you indicated that there's day care -- a day-care facility.

MS. CONNER: Oh, goodness, I forgot about that. Yes, ma'am. So there's also a day care facility on Falmouth Drive a couple of doors down that I marked on there, as well. They have two children of their own, but they also have an in-home day care there, as well. So not only do we have 36-plus children, because I think there's still more children. I marked what I was aware of, what some of my neighbors, because most of the kids that we play with or my kids play with are Danvers and North Brookline. A neighbor here with me tonight would help me with the Falmouth. We know some neighbors on Falmouth, but not all of them, so I believe there are more kids, but, yes, there is the child-care facility there, as well.

MS. ORTIZ: Just to follow up. So that would be a business. Correct?

MS. CONNER: I don't know. I didn't know about it until tonight. I didn't know about it until tonight, so --

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you.

MS. CONNER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions for this speaker? Seeing --

MS. CONNER: Can I make comment to the business?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very quickly, please.

MS. CONNER: Okay. I think there's a difference between how -- taking care of children, and people that you don't know coming in and out of your neighborhood on a regular basis.

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

MS. FOWLER: Good evening. My name is Pat Fowler; I live at 606 North Sixth Street. And what strikes me about this application is that the nice person who just talked with genuine concerns about her neighborhood is echoing the concerns of every neighborhood, including mine that has been zoned R-MF, even though we persist in having single-family uses. So what I'm seeing long term, and I know we have an ordinance up for discussion at the end of the meeting. Sadly, I won't be able to stay, but I have written remarks that someone else will deliver to you when that items comes up, is that we're more likely to put these in R-2 and R-MF neighborhoods and less likely to put them in R-1 neighborhoods. So if we want to be an equitable city, and if we want to allow this industry to continue to prosper in our community, we have to have an even hand, that all neighborhoods have to attend to the impacts of this, both the positive and the negative, equally. In my neighborhood and where I put my head at night is as safe and sacred a place to the families on my street as they are to the families that live on North Brookline Drive and the adjacent streets. And I think we keep forgetting that, which is one of the reasons it concerns me that we're ready to change an ordinance while it has just come into full operation. And, again, I'm sorry I can't stay. I'm 65 years old and still working full time, and it takes more out of me than it used to. I used to do my time here until 1:00 at night, and I can't do it anymore and keep my full-time job. So someone else is going to bring you my written comments about what you're going to do. It's the

last agenda item here. But please think about the fairness to those of us who live in family neighborhoods with little kids on bicycles like we have on North Sixth Street, and we have problem properties and we have all the same concerns they have, and make sure that if we're going to do this, we spread them equally across all zoning areas in proportion to the number and size of that zoning area in our City. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Pat. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you. Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward. I'm about to call it. If you're coming, please come. No. One at a time. If you're coming, please come. Come on.

MS. BOGNER: Sorry. This man said we could come up together.

MS. GEUEA JONES: No.

MR. STANTON: One to speak at a time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: One at a time. You can come and sit on the front row, but you can't come up to the podium together. Please, name and address for the record.

MS. BOGNER: My name is Bailee Bogner, and my husband and I are the owners at 411 North Brookline. Am I allowed to just hand you all a --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes, please. Commissioner Darr will take it from you. We forgot to tell you that's the role you get sitting on the end.

MS. BOGNER: I just want to begin by saying thank you so much for your time and for all the ways that you serve our city. Both Denver and Brooke that spoke tonight are neighbors that we have had the opportunity to get to know and chat in our front yards over the last six years since we bought the home, and so they are special important people to us and we do respect their opinion. So my husband and I bought the home on 411 North Brookline six years ago, just after we got married. It was our very first house. We updated inside and out with our own hands, and drank coffee on the front porch and had late-night conversations around the bonfire and that's where we welcomed our first baby and it's more than just a house to us, it's really where we became a family. It's not just a house that we bought to turn into an Airbnb. So last year, as our family started to grow, we moved outside of town. We live off the Midway exit. And we have a one-year-old who keeps us very busy, and another baby due in July, and so our hearts are still very much tied to Brookline. We still spend a lot of time there as we take care of the property, and it's a big part of our story. So when we moved out to Rocheport, we decided to keep the home and open it as a short-term rental through Airbnb. We've hosted with one clear goal, and that has been to be good neighbors to people like Brooke and Denver. And we do our best to carefully screen every guest. We set our prices in a way that attracts quiet families, and many of whom are visiting loved ones in Columbia, and we're very clear about expectations -- no parties, no pets, no smoking, and quiet hours from 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. You can see our little house rules section on page two of your handout. That's the welcome sheet that's inside our Airbnb when people arrive. So we don't just hand over the keys and hope for the best. We're actively involved, always reachable by our guests and our

neighbors, and we're deeply invested. So since becoming a full-time rental, last year we received nothing but five-star reviews from our guests, and we have verbal support from every direct neighbor that we have, as we've just encountered them in our neighborhood. And the last page of your handout is a letter that we hand delivered to all of our neighbors this past week just because we were -- they were, you know, chatting with us about confusion of, like, what does this postcard mean and why is there a sign in your yard, and it was just sort of shocking to our neighbors, so we went and handed out letters to everyone and one of them texted me and just said, hey, my husband and I just -- she lives -- it's a direct neighbor right to the left of our home, and she said just want you to let you know you have full support of a rental. We haven't had any issues with the renters, and appreciate how engaged you are with maintaining the situation. Let us know if you ever need assistance, and she even asked for our listing link so she could share it with her family when they are visiting. That support means so much to us. And we're also honored that we just last week, we got to host a family member of another direct neighbor, so something we enjoy getting to do. This home has helped us support our young family, and allowed me the privilege of staying home with our babies during this tender and fleeting season of life, and we're just trying to use something that we already have loved in a way that helps others and honors the community that we have been a part of. And so thank you for hearing from us and we do hope that you allow us to continue to do something that we care about in a way that reflects the values of our family and the city of Columbia.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Do you have any comment that you wanted to make about the party that was held? I guess the police were called?

MS. BOGNER: Yes. Sure. So just to be fully transparent, Brooke described it pretty well. A young gal that goes to high school in town got her mom's Airbnb account and logged in and booked our home, and had a conversation with me about her plans as an adult and lied about what they were doing. And then they booked the house for one night. And so then by the time the next morning came and we realized what was happening, it was -- it was really devastating for me. You know, I'm, like, walking up on the driveway, and going what's happening? And -- and so that was really unfortunate. That was our fifth -- so we've hosted about 60 guests last year, I believe, and since going full time, and that was our fifth guest ever since we had moved out of the house, and so it happened really early on. And I'm glad that it happened -- I don't -- I wish it wouldn't have, but I'm glad it happened early on, because since then, it has just allowed us to use a lot more wisdom and discretion in who we allow. And so Brooke did call the police, rightfully so. Like we've told neighbors, if you ever see anything going on that makes you feel uncomfortable, please call the police, you know. Like call them before you call me. And so, yeah, they smoked marijuana in the home and they were loud and in the front yard, and it was super unfortunate. And so we did our very best to give our sincerest apologies to our neighbors, and we haven't had a single incident happen since then, and I do believe that is because of our screening. We receive a message from everyone about why they are coming, and you have to have perfect five-star reviews as a guest in



order to book our home. So if you don't have it, stayed at Airbnb before and haven't received five-star reviews, then you aren't allowed to book our home. So that's something that we have implemented. And then I just am messaging them and asking them questions, and trying to get clarity. And the people who are happy to answer all of my questions have been very kind guests, and usually the ones who don't want to answer my questions just never book. And so that's just one of the ways that we've increased our screening process, because I think something that's different for us is that the house means so much to us and our neighbors mean so much to us, that the last thing that we want is just, like, you know, \$250. It's not worth it for us to have guests that -- so I hope that answers your question.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. Thank you. Any further questions? Commissioner Wilson and then Brodsky.

MS. WILSON: Thank you for coming. I wondered if you were aware, and I'm also making a statement for the neighbors, that had you already had your license and someone made this complaint, this would be strike one of two where if you had two strikes, there's the opportunity for you to lose your license. So I just wanted to make you aware that that's an opportunity, and to find out if you were aware and to say that so that everybody is aware.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I noticed on one of the handouts we got that -- but it looks when there was this issue, folks did have your contact information to reach out to you directly?

MS. BOGNER: Yeah. Both Brooke and another neighbor, his son stayed in our home recently, both reached out me, like, personal phone number and was, like, hey, is everything okay because it was so early on that there was just like had they moved out completely, or is this an Airbnb. Yes. And so they were also concerned for our safety. And we were able to talk to them both after the incident. But, yeah, I have records of the messages that we exchanged when the incident occurred.

MR. BRODSKY: Thank you for just giving your neighbors your contact information because we have seen many cases where that isn't the situation, so thank you.

MS. BOGNER: Yeah. All of our direct neighbors have our personal phone numbers. Yeah.

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

MR. WALTERS: Although this is not required, but do you -- you have a doorbell cam on the house?

MS. BOGNER: Yes, sir. And a garage camera

MR. WALTERS: Now were they active at the time of this -- that incident occurred?

MS. BOGNER: They were. The details, there's a detailed --

MR. WALTERS: That's okay. I don't mean -- I just.

MS. BOGNER: The reason that there was no red flags is because the mother, who -- whose account that it was booked on, eventually saw the charge on her credit card, and was, like, what is this, \$400 on Airbnb? And then the daughter was, like, oh, yeah, I booked this to host my 18th birthday party.

And against her better judgment, the mother allowed her to continue to be in my home alone, but her mother brought her to the Airbnb. So when they showed up on my -- on my camera, the mother and the daughter both arrived. And so I'm, like, oh the mother and daughter checked in. And then later at night, the mother left and the daughter invited all of these people, and I was asleep and we didn't know. It was -- it was very unfortunate, yeah.

MR. WALTERS: All right. Thank you.

MS. BOGNER: So it -- then, you know, two weeks ago, somebody is, like, hey, can I have my 18th birthday party there, and my parents are going to be there. And I was, like, no, I'm sorry. Like, even if you say your mom is going to be there, I don't believe you, so -- yeah. Yeah. Thank you for your question.

MR. WALTERS: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions for the applicant?

Seeing none. Thank you very much./

MS. BOGNER: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would you like to come up?

MR. BOGNER: Kyle Bogner, representing 411 North Brookline. I think she said most of -- of everything that we could say. Obviously, I'll throw in my vote for support, but really, I maintain it, and I'm there all the time and do all the maintenance and mowing the lawn and all that stuff. We're actually paying one of the neighborhood kids to mow the lawn this summer, which is amazing for me. But to keep it short, I can answer any other questions specifically that you guys might have, but otherwise, I know your agenda is busy.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much for being here. Anyone else to speak on this case? Last call. Very good. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: So I'm still trying to catch up a little bit on the short-term rental stuff, but would this -- these conditional use permits, is there any paperwork that has to be done if there's a change in ownership?

MS. GEUEA JONES: The license does not transfer if there's a change in ownership of the property. They would have to start all over.

MR. DARR: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further Commissioner comments? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: The testimony that I heard seems to be surrounding one incident. Maybe I'm wrong, maybe I'm right. Seems like one incident.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: Say it again. The first applicants are the ones that set the tone, and if they don't, that makes it look bad and then it hurts everybody else. Kind of on the fence with this one because we do have neighborhood interaction, but I think it was based on one issue.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And we also had neighborhood support. Did you want to make a motion?

MR. STANTON: No. I'm going to let it ride a little bit. I might come back around when I see what my Commissioners say.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would anyone like to make a motion or comment on this case?

MR. WALTERS: I can make a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: In regard to Case Number 193-2025, I move to approve the requested STR CUP subject to the following: Condition that maximum usage shall not exceed 210 nights annually; a maximum of eight transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC; and that two garage parking spaces be made available while the building is used as an STR.

MS. WILSON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Walters, seconded by Commissioner Wilson. Is there any discussion on the motion? I would just state for the record that -- oh, sorry.

MS. ORTIZ: You can go ahead if -- or I can go.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead, Commissioner Ortiz.

MS. ORTIZ: All right. I just want to say thank you to the -- to the neighbors that gave their feedback, and I feel like when I was asking about the day care, that came off way sassier than I meant it to. And I share your concerns and they are valid, and I just want to validate that, but I do plan to support on the short-term rental, and there is recourse if they have a license that if something were to happen, you would have an avenue to go through.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Last call for discussion. Then I'll do mine. I just wanted to state for the record that there is both opposition and support from direct neighbors on either side of this property. And while I am concerned that it sounds like there was pretty significant incident early on, it also sounds like the applicant and neighbors were able to work that out between themselves. And as Commissioner Wilson pointed out, and Commissioner Ortiz both, there will be significant recourse if they violate the ordinance in the future in the way that they would not be if they continued to operate illegally at this point. So also thank you to the applicant for meeting the June 1st deadline. We do appreciate that. And with that, if there's no further discussion, Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Stockton, Dr. Gray.**  
**Voting No: Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 8-1.**

MR BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. By your vote of 8-1, that recommendation will be forwarded

to City Council. Moving on to our next case.

**Case Number 194-2025**

**A request by Anne Caverte (Owner) to allow 3407 Goldenwood Drive to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of six transient guests and up to 210 nights annually pursuant to Section 29-3.3(vv) and Section 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The 0.21-acre subject site is zoned R-1 (One-family dwelling), is located northeast of the intersection of Arbor Pointe Parkway and Goldenwood Drive, and is addressed at 3407 Goldenwood Drive.**

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 3407 Goldenwood Drive to be operated as a STR subject to:

1. The maximum occupancy permitted within the dwelling shall not exceed 6 transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC); and
2. One garage parking space be made available for the required on-site/off-street parking while the dwelling is being used as an STR; and
3. A maximum of 210 nights of annual 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 a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there questions for Staff? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Is this property, isn't it -- it looks like it's about 400 feet from school -- from a school?

MR. HALLIGAN: Yeah, roughly.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. And that's an elementary school?

MR. HALLIGAN: An elementary school, yes.

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions? I -- you may not know the answer to this, and for the members of the public that are about to come up, if any of you can answer it, that will be helpful. Some of the public comment mentions -- are there two addresses? What is going on here? 3411 and 3407. I'm just confused.

MR. HALLIGAN: 3411 was a past case that was approved -- the CUP was approved for.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it.

MR. HALLIGAN: So that was 3411 Goldenwood Drive. Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. We've done enough of these that I no longer remember every address. Thank you for that clarification.

MR. HALLIGAN: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any members of the public are here to speak on this case tonight, please come forward. Stand up now or I will close public hearing. Thank you. State your name and address for the record, and three minutes for an individual, six minutes for the applicant or group.

MS. CAVERTE: Yeah. Hi. My name is Anne Margaret Caverte. I am the owner of 3407 Goldenwood Drive. Can you hear me okay?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you pull it down a little closer, yeah.

MS. CAVERTE: Yeah. I felt like I was not speaking very -- (inaudible) -- but anyway, again, my name is Anne Margaret Caverte. I am the owner of 3407 Goldenwood Drive, and I wanted to address a few of the questions that were brought up. The first one that I wanted to address was the HOA complaint. I have been operating as a STR since June 27th of 2024. We had a blanket rental license at the time, and I was very sure that I'm was going to be using it as a short-term rental because that's the easiest for me to operate on and have found a good property manager that will be able to do the screening for me. And so I wrote that in my application. And so the description shows that it says short-term rental. And when I recently changed into -- pivoted to MTR at midterm and have now a 34-day renter, they were asking if they can use the community pool. And because I didn't know if the HOA has the same definitions as the City, I went ahead and asked the HOA. Previously, by the way, HOA knew that I was doing this since January of 2024 because I've been in communication with them and the only stipulation that they have is that if I am going to have a for rent sign, that I'm only allowed one, but that was it. But I went over above and beyond with everything that's necessary and made sure that I required two days of rental so that I get rid of the issues like parties and stuff. But anyway, going back to the HOA, I did ask them in May 2025, because of my renter right now, and they pulled my license from the City and they saw that the description says short-term rental and kind of flagged that. And I think that is the reason for the miscommunication, but it's not that I violated a short-term rental requirement from the City or from the HOA. I forgot what the other two were, but I knew that there were two other issues that were brought up and I wanted to address them if you were --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think we're good. Maybe we will go to questions --

MS. CAVERTE: Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- unless you had something else.

MS. CAVERTE: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Questions for the applicant? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Thank you for providing the clarity. I will also provide some clarity. So technically, you are correct. There was no regulation, so you were not in violation of something that didn't exist. However, it was also not a use that it was permitted. So, yeah, which is why you're here

today, to straighten it all out. Right? And so we're grateful for that opportunity. But the public record should be that now it is an illegal use because our regulations went into place at the beginning of June. So again, we appreciate you being here and providing an example of what we need to do to make sure that we set things right. Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for the applicant? I did have a question. One of the letters that we got from your neighbors mentioned noise. Have you had any noise complaints? Have any of the neighbors talked to you about issues at all?

MS. CAVERTE: Not at all. I think the problem is that -- because at least based on the Facebook posts that I have seen, that there was some conflation between the properties that are close to me, and so I've straightened that out in the Facebook posts that no -- have not received anything. And my neighbors, I've provided my information, my e-mail and my phone number.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You're listed on short-term rental sites. Are you also listed on, like, Furnished Finder and those where it's, like, a month at a time?

MS. CAVERTE: Yes. That is correct. I started that because we're coming up on June the 1st, and I don't have an actual license to do short-term rentals.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right.

MS. CAVERTE: And I currently have a 34-day tenant in the house.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Mr. Stanton, go ahead.

MR. STANTON: I don't have the application. How close is your registering agent, like the person, stuff -- stuff goes bad, how fast are they going to get there and who is it?

MS. CAVERTE: Her name is Kristen Samuels, and she is about ten minutes -- I think they have it as 11 minutes on the slides.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none. Thank you for being here.

MS. CAVERTE: All right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any members of the public to speak on this case, please come forward now. Name and address for the record, please. You'll have three minutes.

MR. BENTLEY: Clyde Bentley, 1863 Cliff Drive. Am I correct that there is another registered place within 300 feet? I didn't hear anything that justifies violating the law. The law just says that if they're close, you can't do it. If it was a resident owner, it -- there would be a chance to -- to get an exemption, but the law seems pretty clear here that there's only one per 300 feet, so I don't understand why it is -- it goes forward.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's actually not correct. The law says that if they're within 300 feet, that's one of the factors that we take into consideration. It's not just a straight ban.

MR. BENTLEY: I didn't read it that way.

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

MS. DOKKEN: Dee Dokken, 804 Again. And I was going to talk -- speak on this, too. That's 300-foot buffer is the only tool we have to control density and the availability of housing. Every non-residential operator, every investor operator of STRs is taking away a home that a family could live in. And the 300-foot limit, if we're just going to skim over it every time, means too many STRs will be in a neighborhood and in the city. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for Ms. Dokken? Seeing none. Thank you. Any other member of the public to speak, please come forward. Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Darr, and then Commissioner Stanton.

MR. DARR: I didn't see any comment from HOA or representative come and speak, so I -- I don't know what to make of that, I just wanted to say it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: They did send in written.

MR. DARR: Oh, they did?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. CRAIG: Which also it is policy of the City not to get involved with private covenants, so if there's any obstacle to the operation of an STR post-issuance, if this Commission chooses to issue that with the HOA, that's something that they deal with. The City does not insert itself into the enforcement of private covenants, so --

MR. DARR: Yeah. I guess I was more making the point that if they were -- if they weren't in favor of it, they would have appeared to say they weren't in favor of it, but it looks like they did. I just didn't see this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I want to address the buffering, and, yes, it doesn't disqualify you from obtaining a short-term rental permit, but we -- we look at that. We look at that distance because that -- the reason why that came about, because I've been here a real long time and I helped write the thing. It's so that we can address density, so you're right. It's something to be looked at, just like the distance from a school is something we look that. It is just factors that are important to us and that's why it's addressed in the -- in the report.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other Commissioner comment? Would anyone like to make a motion? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: In the matter of Case Number 194-2025, located at 3407 Goldenwood Drive, requesting an STR conditional use permit, I recommend approval of the requested STR CUP subject to

the following: Condition that maximum usage shall not exceed 210 nights annually, a maximum of six transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC, and one garage parking space be made available while the dwelling is used as an STR.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Wilson, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I do not intend on supporting this one, thanks partially to the public comment and the feedback that we got from neighbors. I think it's -- it's too -- it's too close to the other short-term rental that has already been approved, and based on that factor, that's what's contributing to my decision.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any further Commissioner comment or discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, we're ready for a roll call.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Stockton. Voting No: Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Walters, Dr. Gray. Motion fails 3 to 6.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion fails.

MS. GEUEA JONES: By your vote of three to six, we will send the recommendation of denial to City Council. Moving on to our next case.

#### **Case Number 196-2025**

**A request by Jonathan Gray (agent), on behalf of A.G. Jones Properties, LLC (owner) for approval to use 1516 Wilson Avenue as a short-term rental for a maximum of eight transient guests and up to 210 nights annually pursuant to Section 29-3.3(vv) and Section 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.48-acre site is zoned R-1 (One-Family Dwelling), is located southwest of the intersection of Wilson Avenue and South William Street, and is addressed 1516 Wilson Avenue.**

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of conditional use permit to allow the dwelling at 1516 Wilson Avenue to be operated as a STR subject to:

1. The maximum occupancy of 8 transient guests regardless of occupancy permitted by the most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC); and
2. A maximum of 210 nights of annual usage

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any -- 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. Sorry. Commissioner Ortiz, go ahead.

MS. ORTIZ: I don't have, like, any vested interest, but I did receive a few e-mails because I live on this block, and I'm a part of, like, a listserv for my neighborhood, but I didn't really pay much attention



either way until today, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you for that disclosure. Any questions for Staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any members of the public are here for this case, please come forward.

MR. EDMONDSON: Hello. My name is Logan Edmondson; I'm a grad student at Mizzou and I live at 1728 East Broadway in East Campus. I'm actually here in opposition to the short-term rental at this address, and that is because of the increase in housing demand in Boone County. Data collected by the city of Columbia suggests that 37,000 more housing units need to be built by 2050 to match the increase in demand. An analysis of housing gaps in Columbia suggests that at least 208 single-family homes need to enter the housing supply pool yearly to match that demand. Allowing short-term rentals to operate out of these single-family homes effectively remove multiple potential units from the housing supply, and this puts a strain on the city's housing infrastructure inflating rents and housing costs, especially in areas like East Campus where there are a high concentration of renters.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry, sir. Do you have any comment about this particular property?

MR. EDMONDSON: Yeah. I'm commenting this about this particular property since I live in the East Campus neighborhood, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good.

MR. EDMONDSON: -- that's -- yeah. I wanted to keep it quick, because it's, like -- so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Have you had any problems with this particular property?

MR. EDMONDSON: No.

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. Okay. So they haven't had big parties or anything?

MR. EDMONDSON: No. I bike by that property every single day though, and it makes me sad that there's not somebody living in there full time. I guess that's the extent of my problem, but --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Appreciate that.

MR. EDMONDSON: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much for being here tonight. Next, please come forward.

MR. JONES: Hi. My name is Jerry Jones; my wife and I are the owners of 1516 Wilson through A.G. Jones Properties. My primary address is 2609 Saddle Ridge Lane, Cape Girardeau, Missouri. So a couple of things I want to address. I -- he did mention that it was a vacant lot, but we do spend quite a bit of time at this home. Columbia is a second home town for us. I spent seven years of my life up here. I have two degrees from the University of Missouri. My wife graduated from Stephens. I have two children in school here now, so it's very important to us, and this house is important to us, and we do spend two to three months a year in the house ourselves. So -- and one of the big things I want to address, so I don't sound like a scoundrel because we had five violations, but actually there's a good

explanation for all of them, but one is a rental compliance. We weren't renting the house, but I guess they -- the City assumed we were since it's in a rental neighborhood. As I said, there's 93 percent of our neighbors are rentals, and most of them are multi-family. We're one of the few R-1s around. Excuse me. But -- so I went ahead and applied for a rental license anyway because I assumed at some point we would, but we never have rented the house to anyone other than through Airbnb which we started almost two years ago. So since then, we've owned the house for three and a half years. The last two years, we rented it on Airbnb. We have a very good manager, Jonathan Gray, who couldn't be here tonight. But we've received 45 five-star reviews. Our only one person gave us a four on part of the review because she said our neighbors were too noisy. So, as you know, the East Campus is a very lively area, to put it nicely. But that's part of what I think people like about this home. It's an historic home. I think it would be a shame to be a student rental. I think -- it's close to campus. Got a lot of people that -- it's mostly a lot of parents that come to see their kids, and they live in the East Campus or on campus, and we didn't rent it that much. I think it was 80 days or something. So it's not something that there's a lot of people in and out all the time. But I just want to say, you know -- you know, it's a very important property to us. I think we've -- we've put a lot of hard work and money into it. It has -- I think it's one of the nicest homes in the East Campus neighborhood, and I just would be glad to answer any questions that you may have now.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Do you have a relation to Three-P Properties?

MS. JONES: To who?

MS. ORTIZ: Three-P Properties. I just noticed all of the correspondence from them.

MS. JONES: I was surprised because I don't know who they are, but they unsolicited put those in there, so I didn't ask them to do that. I don't know who they are, but they apparently are --

MS. ORTIZ: Love you.

MR. JONES: Well, I mean, I think they take good care of the home, and it's nice. And I'm kind of a yard guy, so I took -- it had some crazy landscaping there before that just we've tried to tame, but we -- I think we've done a pretty good job of it now, but -- no, I don't. I don't -- but I appreciate their support.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions for the applicant? Commissioner Stockman?

MS. STOCKMAN: I was just doing a quick Google search on it, and I knew it was historic, but I didn't know the significance. So whatever happens to it, I mean, I would hope that that was -- would be retained, so I appreciate you being cognizant of that.

MR. JONES: All right. Well, we -- it's -- we have named it the Walter Miller home because it was built by Walter Miller, who is a professor at the University back in 1916. And I don't know if you have ever heard of the guy, but he was -- he was a dean of the graduate school at Mizzou, and left to start the classics department at Stanford University. His wife was the niece of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Her name

is Jennie Emerson. So it's kind of got a neat history. It's got a really neat den that I'm sure he wrote a lot of books in and studied. And so, you know, we were aware of that and the history and we're proud of that.

MS. STOCKMAN: Put a plaque up.

MR. JONES: Yeah. We've got a plaque that says historic home. That came with when we bought it, but, you know, I would like for our guests, too, to know about this -- the history of it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions for this speaker? So you live in Cape?

MR. JONES: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You have an agent that is here in town?

MR. JONES: Correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Has your agent done anything to be better about the general, like, vegetation upkeep, making sure the roll cart is back, some of that stuff, because those are also some complaints, not just the --

MR. JONES: Well, I saw that, and you know, I don't know, you know, maybe it would stay out overnight one time, but, no. We have -- he usually comes and it was on a Monday, and he usually comes and puts it up, you know, after they pick up the trash on Monday. I don't know what happened. I don't know if somebody was, you know, picking on me or what. But -- and the poison ivy thing is actually a tree that is in the City right of way, and I don't think my yard guy -- I don't think we're responsible for it, but we've adopted it. It was not getting trimmed. And so, but we've taken that, you know, as our own project now, and it's -- it's not a problem any longer.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. Any further questions for the applicant? Thank you very much for being here tonight./

MR. JONES: Thank you.

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

MR. NORGARD: I'm Peter Norgard, 1602 Hinkson Avenue, and this is really a question for staff. I heard you say that the noise impact was determined by staff to be insignificant, and I'm wondering what standards you use, not specifically for this application, but in general because I think some of us out in the audience are confused by the standards that are applied.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: There is no evidence of any noise complaints having been filed with the City as it relates to out-of-control parties. Often, we have developments or homes that are actually with fenced-in rear yards. There is an occasion that there is always the opportunity and an occasion for guests to be more boisterous than maybe an adjacent property owner would like them to be, though, likewise, the adjacent property owner may have guests that are just as boisterous if not offensive to those that may be in the short-term rental. So, generally speaking, most of our analysis is based on more of a observation of conditions, not an actual scientific analysis using a noise meter because we aren't there when the

actual tenants may be there or the guests, so we have to rely on what is reported.

MR. NORGARD: And that would generally be through the police?

MR. ZENNER: That would be correct, and it would be -- we review those records. We have contact with the police department with every application that is evaluated as to what their records indicate is submitted complaints. We go through all of our records with our Housing and Neighborhood Services staff as a method by which to identify for the Commission what complaints and how those complaints have been resolved or if they are still outstanding.

MR. NORGARD: And then one final question for you. What is the fraction of complaints that are called in that CPD responds to and then actually files an official complaint; do you have any idea?

MR. ZENNER: I do not, Mr. Norgard.

MR. NORGARD: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for this speaker from the Commission. Seeing none. Thank you very much. Anyone else from the public to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. BENTLEY: I'm Clyde Bentley, 1863 Cliff Drive in the East Campus. And I want to say that, given the style of this house and its location in a densely -- dense rental area, this is an appropriate use of the STR ordinance, and it's a good way of saving a grand and historical old house. That said, it also raises a couple of things. There is another rental within 200 feet, but it's not registered, and that, when it goes to register, I would oppose that for the density. If the new house, when this property is split, I would not like to see that also become a short-term rental next door to this one. But as far as right now, it's a grand old house. It's a wonderful house and the type that I think I would rent as a short-term rental, and I would support it for that reason.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Anyone else from the public to come forward? Going once, going twice. Very good. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any commissioner comments? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, if my colleagues have no further comment, I would like to entertain a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further comments from the Commissioners? Seeing none. Please go ahead, Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 196-2025, 1516 Wilson Avenue, I move to approve the requested STR CUP subject to the following conditions: That maximum use of 210 days maximum, annually; a maximum of eight transient guests regardless of the allowance permitted by the IPMC.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? I would point out for the record that all of our

neighborhood comments were positive and while there is a history of complaints, they are not coming directly from neighbors. Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Just a clarification. There actually was one that was submitted later that is in opposition.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, thank you. I had forgot about the one that was printed in front of us, so there is -- there is one opposition and several in support. Thank you for that, Commissioner Ortiz.

MS. ORTIZ: I do have a comment, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please go ahead.

MS. ORTIZ: I land close to Clyde on this one. I think given -- I live on this block. It's a very noisy area. It's students, a lot of students there. And I think that this house being historic, I think it makes sense to have this kind of rental here, so I'm going to vote that way.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any further Commissioner comments? And I apologize, it is very late. We also had a speaker against this. I was not trying to ignore you, I just literally forgot, that that was on this case. So we have had some opposition and some support on -- on this one from the neighbors. Any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, when you're ready.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Stockton, Dr. Gray. Motion carries 9-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

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

#### **Case Number 202-2025**

**A request by Peter Yronwode and Paula McFarling (agents), on behalf of Yronwode-McFarling revocable trust (owner), seeking approval to use 105 Pinewood Drive as a short-term rental for a maximum of 210 nights annually and six transient guests subject to the provisions of Section 29-3.3(vv) and Section 29-6.4(m)(2) of the United Development Code. The 0.17 acre subject site is zoned R-2 (Two-family Dwelling), is located 400 feet south of the intersection of West Ash Street and Pinewood Drive, and is addressed 105 Pinewood Drive.**

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 105 Pinewood Drive to be operated as a STR subject to:

1. The maximum occupancy permitted within the dwelling shall not exceed 4 transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC), provided that if 1 additional UDC-compliant parking space is added on-site/off-street

- occupancy may not exceed 6 transient guests; and
2. The garage shall be made available while the dwelling is used as a short-term rental; and
  3. A maximum of 210 nights of annual usage

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

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. MCFARLING: Hello. My name is Paula McFarling. My husband and I own this property at 105 Pinewood. We live at 203 Orchard Court within two miles walking distance of this house, so we're always available if there is any need with guests or with neighbors. We've owned this home for 17 years. We bought it for my son to live in and his family, so we're very familiar with the neighborhood. In fact, we've been there longer than a lot of the people who live on the block. We feel like we're part of that neighborhood. We've had it as a short-term rental for seven years now. We haven't had any trouble, no complaints, no complaints from neighbors. We bought the house for my son to live in and we sort of carried forward that feeling of family. When we travel, our family uses Airbnbs. We have a toy room in the house. We advertise it as a cozy family-centered home. That's really what we focus on is getting families in there. It's -- that's -- they appreciate that this is in a quiet neighborhood. It's near a park. So that's a -- that's a lot of what our focus has been. Families come to town for a wide variety of reasons, you know, to visit family. One comment I would like to make as you move forward with regulations is that this house, the way the regulations are set up, we could either take away the front yard and put another parking pad there so that we can add more residents. Not -- resale value would just plummet if the whole front yard is concrete. It's a neighborhood. No one has a big driveway in the whole neighborhood. So with a limit of four people, if I have a mother and a father with three children, because children count as the people, I have to turn them down. So I just want you to think about that as you move forward with regulations, that the house is set up for families, but I have to limit that. We've had no parties, no complaints, Over time, we've had 250 different groups stay there. We only had one -- no one complained about it, but it was quite embarrassing. We had a lot of men who were doing work for the City that had a lot -- for the City, as a matter of fact, and they had a lot of trucks parked on the street. We were not aware that that was -- that was going to happen, and so we apologized to the neighborhood for that inconvenience. But no one -- no one complained to us about it, but we were embarrassed, you know. So that's all I have to say really.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for the applicant? Commissioner Stockton?

MS. STOCKTON: It sounds like you've lived there a long time, so did you, just out of curiosity, kind of tell your neighbors before you went into this process, I assume, before you set it up as a short-term rental?

MS. MCFARLEY: Uh-huh. We had it set up as a rental, and then the last couple groups that we had renting the house were -- caused some trouble. So, in fact, it's actually much better for the neighborhood as a short-term rental than some of the people we had in there, even though they all had been screened, also.

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

MS. GRANFIELD: (Inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry. I'm going to have to ask you do it into the microphone.

MS. GRANFIELD: My name is Mary Louise Granfield, and I live at 108 Pinewood Drive, and I'm against increasing people in the neighborhood. These people may be friends to each other and families to each other, but the people going in there are strangers to us. Everyone has a family and everyone has strangers, and I have lived at Pinewood for about six, seven years, and I see that the neighborhood is deteriorating and its sense of community, and neighbors that know each other, there are more people that are strangers that we do not know them. And it is introducing a certain amount of fear and it's damaging the attitude that was existing when I first moved in there. For instance, to my left on the east side, there is short term rental who rents strictly to college students, and although I haven't had a lot of problems with the students, I have had a problem or two with the renter because he is unresponsive. He tore down this old fence and threw it in my yard, and I would honestly tell you the students seem to be more friendly and responsive than the -- than the owner, and I think you should have good respect for each other and be able to communicate with problems. He moved all his trash out of my yard when I told him that I was finished trying to get him to move that fence that he tore down out of my yard, that I was going to start charging him. And he said I'll take care of it. I get it now. And he got it out of there in two days. That's not a good relationship with somebody. And on the other side of my house was a farmer and his wife who had -- this is their second house because the wife had cancer and had died, and they wanted to be close to medical facilities. They lived there before I got there, and they were very stable, good community members, and they both died and now it's in probate. And next to me, I have people that are known drug users, and this contention between the -- (inaudible) -- family and this other group, and they come in at night, and they go -- my bedroom is right next to where they come in, got people with very wealthy cars, people with cars that barely move, they come and go quickly at night and it's kind of scary thinking of who they could be, and they're strangers, too. And now we have the Airbnb that she refers to, and initially there were problems with -- with their residents, but they moved quickly to get the rules together and they have not been a problem to me. They are not problem guests, there's just too many strangers in the neighborhood, and there's too many close together. And I think that we're -- are already sheltering enough people that we do not even know who they are, they just come and go, and there's a certain amount of petty theft too insignificant to even bother the police with, but there has been some petty theft there going right on, so and that is why I stand opposed to it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you so much, ma'am, for being here this evening and for staying so long. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight.

MS. GRANFIELD: Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Of course. Next speaker, please come forward.

MR. PHERIGO: Hello. My name is Eric Pherigo, my wife and I live next door at 103 Pinewood Drive, and here to support Paula and Peter in their -- in their request to have an STR that does allow up to six people. We haven't had any problems with any of the guests that have stayed there. Matter of fact, we kind of welcome the diversity, as well as we welcome our neighbors, like Mary Lou. It does bring an added joy to the street, and the one time that they did have the crew that was working for the City, they were, like, real people. We approached them and said hey, don't park in front of us or anyone else, and they didn't. They abided. And if there has ever been any need to speak with Peter and Paula, they have always been very responsive, they're always in the neighborhood. This is what we want for STRs, I think, people who live in the area, and the fact that there isn't another STR within 300 feet or further, I think that -- that should -- I think that does bring something to the street. And also to speak to Peter and Paula, they are stalwarts in the neighborhood, they are stalwarts in the town of Columbia. They bring a lot to our community and always have. If you know the history, if they explained it at all, they're great people, and we do support it and we appreciate your time in doing what you're doing. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next member of the public to speak on this case, please come forward. We're waiting for Mr. Yronwode.

MR. YRONWODE: As Paula explained, my name is Peter Yronwode; we live at 203 Orchard Court, and it is not two miles away from the subject tract, it's not even one mile away. I can get there in about seven minutes in a car and maybe ten on a bicycle, but I haven't done that lately. Thank you for your tolerance of my lung condition. I hope that I don't disturb this hearing any further by coughing. A couple of comments. We like Mary Lou. We see her puttering around all the time, and it's pleasant to me to see an older person still getting around and taking care of business. And I think, however, regarding her complaints, I don't believe that either of her neighbors are short-term renters. They certainly don't show up in the staff analysis, so -- and if they are regular renters, frankly, that's one of the reasons that we converted this property from a conventional rental to a STR because how much damage can any short-term renter do in a weekend, whereas people who are living there for months, maybe years, there's no telling. And I can vouch for the fact that at least our property was pretty severely damaged by the last tenants -- conventional tenants that we had, whereas we never see any problems with the short-term renters. This whole street was built approximately at the same time in the mid-50s. They're small houses designed for small families. That's why this one only has one and a half baths, and the half is in the basement. And I was -- I'm sure you've seen houses like that that just have a stand-alone toilet and a concrete shower. Well, it's no longer that way. I walled it in. It's painted, it's pretty,



and our guests use it. And that's just one of many improvements that we've made. We've tried to plant flowers. We replaced the microwave, the dishwasher, the washer, the dryer, the downstairs toilet, the garbage disposal, and the vent fan in the basement bathroom. In addition, we -- we installed a new electrical service panel and mast on the house. We installed lights in the garage. We have brand-new HVAC, both heating and air-conditioning, and we improved storm water handling, so that there's no longer intrusion of ground water into the basement.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Yronwode, that's your time.

MR. YRONWODE: Oh, well --

MS. GEUEA JONES: We appreciate you. Did you have anything you wanted to add as a wrap-up?

MR. YRONWODE: We feel like we're good neighbors, and we are very careful with screening our guests. And families frequently tell us they'd like to come back, and I can't imagine a better recommendation than that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for Mr. Yronwode? Thank you for being here.

MR. YRONWODE: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any other members of the public that would like to speak on this case? Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any Commissioner comment on the case? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, if my colleagues have nothing else to say --

MS. GEUEA JONES: In the microphone. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: If my colleagues have nothing else to say about this case, I would like to entertain a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I believe we are ready.

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, as it relates to Case 202-2025, 105 Pinewood Drive, STR conditional use permit, I move to approve the request, request the STR CUP subject to the following: Condition that maximum use shall not exceed 210 nights annually, a maximum of four transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC unless one UDC compliant space is added to support a maximum of six guests. The garage parking space be made available while dwelling is used as an STR.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? I think, again, we have a local family with at least some neighbors in support, just for the record, as we go through these approvals. If there is no other discussion, Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Stockton, Dr. Gray.**  
**Motion carries 9-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That is a unanimous vote, and will be forwarded to City Council. Our last case for the evening -- wait. Let me just check in. Do we just want to push forward or do we need a bio break? We can all go individually as long as we leave six people on the dais. Okay. We are pushing forward. We're all going home. Excellent.

**Case Number 215-2025**

**A request by the City of Columbia to amend Sections 29-1.11(a) [Definitions], 29-3.2, Table 29-3.1 [Permitted use Table], 29-3.3 [Use-specific Standards], and 29-6.4(m)(2)(iii)[Conditional Use Permit] of Chapter 29 of the City Code (Unified Development Code) pertaining to the regulation of residential dwellings used for the purposes of short-term rental (STRs), also known as Airbnbs or Vrbos. The amendments propose revisions to definitions specifically tailored to STRs, revisions to the permitted use table indicating what zoning districts allow STRs, and revisions to the STR Tier structure and conditional use permit requirements.**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed text change as presented.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. We will go to questions for staff, but I would like to take this opportunity to remind Commissioners that we will get to Commissioner comments at the end of this process. It is very late. Let's stick to questions for staff and speakers as they come up and save any of our concluding thoughts until we get to that portion so we can try to get through this and respect everyone else's time, as well. Are there any questions for staff on these ordinance changes? Seeing none. New Commissioners, this is your chance. I know that this is your probably first time seeing this, unless you've been paying attention to our work sessions. No questions? Okay. We will go to public comment. Who would like to start?

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: And I will ask -- I will ask that -- come on, Mike. I will ask that, like, come forward as the person in front of, if you want to be next, come sit on the front row so we can keep coming. Go ahead, Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair, Commission. As some of you know, I sat where you sat for eight years until about a year ago, and I've been involved with this, as Mr. Zenner said, for seven years. The purpose of me speaking today is to address two issues that Mr. Zenner brought up. One of those is efficiency and why we're not there, and other one is equality. There may be some other comments along the way. In -- Madam Chair can help me -- summer of '23, we had a joint meeting with

Council in A and B. During that meeting, I had a nice, wonderful chat with our City Manager, Mr. Seewood, and I said De'Carlon -- sorry a little straightforward there -- we're going to need people to oversee this, and we're going to need two. And he said I know. Right now we don't have any. And let me tell you how I got to two. While we doing this, Sharon will remember and some of the rest of you will remember, too, we spent a lot of time doing commission research -- other cities, other countries, how it works. There was a wonderful negative example about ten hours south of us, and that's New Orleans. They opened up with 3,000 STRs and five staff, and were overwhelmed immediately. They have many other legal problems also, but we won't get into that. That's how I came out with the number of two. As Mr. Zenner said, we found 300, 400 initially, figured there were 500 or 600, kind of used that in my mind as an operating number. We needed those two staff a year ago. Mr. Zenner needs them now. Two staff are 4,000 hours. Mr. Zenner's people will be doing other things if they had that. I think that's the biggest efficiency problem whether you accept this amendment or not, you're going -- they're still going to have this issue because he's 45 and 75, something like that, Pat. We've got 120. We think there are 400 more. That is the biggest efficiency issue. There is not -- they don't have the time. I get it. And then you guys don't have the time. Another issue on efficiency, I am opposed to this amendment and we can, by right, do a lot of these and enhance communication. But some of this, the staff members need communication, too, because I did a survey of 15 people that I know that have STRs that have not applied yet. Half of them didn't even know about it. Regardless, if we do buy right in Tier 1, and 30 days is insufficient time. We appreciate that. That was a political decision, and do Tier 1 at 120, and that's an admin. That may bring other people in. Are we there? That may bring other people in. The other thing is equality. Not all owners are equal. We have people paid here today that will tell you their view. We also have about a dozen people here who will tell you another view who are not paid. Thank about that. Any questions?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. Actually, did you do the thing that you're supposed to do when you come up to the microphone and state your name and address for the record.

MR. MACMANN: I did not. My name is Michael MacMann, and I live in the Third Ward.

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next?

MS. SPENCER: I am Kitty Spencer; I live at 1713 Ridgemont. And I spent time this afternoon reading the Boone County and City of Columbia housing study that came out in October of '24. And I would strongly encourage those of you who are new to look over that study. It's very telling, and it's a good resource for current trends in housing in Columbia. So the housing study identifies that 36 percent of all residents, and that's, you know, single-family residents, et cetera, and 51 percent of renters are cost burden, meaning spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing costs. So this study, the

same study documents that housing prices and rents have increased in Boone County between 2023, 2024. As a social worker, I'm a volunteer at Love Columbia, and I can tell you this is true. And so our payment goes way up and people have to get multiple jobs or get new --(inaudible) -- to have new jobs, and it's a real problem. So independent studies have shown that allowing commercial, an investor, in other words, known principal residents in STRs and residential zones lead to increases in housing prices and rents. So I feel like the City Council should be taking steps to create new affordable housing in the City, not passing measures that continue to increase housing costs and reduce housing opportunities for Columbia's permanent residents. And principal residents, I believe, should have the right to operate an STR in their home as an accessory to the residential use without the potential barrier of needing a CUP. So principal resident STRs do not remove housing from available housing stock in a family use -- for family use is what I mean. They don't relieve housing, but commercial STRs, so investor types, they do remove housing from available housing stock for family use, and that's what's happened in our neighborhood -- our neighborhood. A house that would be very affordable, it hasn't gone up above the \$200,000 amount is an STR -- needed to be an STR, and there goes another affordable house for a family. So I just would ask you to think about this proposed ordinance with that in mind.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Ms. Spencer. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. thank you very much for being here tonight.

MS. SPENCER: And thank you for being here tonight.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next?

MR. EDMONDSON: Hello. My name is Logan Edmondson; I live at 1728 East Broadway. I'm going to stay on script here and try to be very brief. I was stopped in the lobby on my way out, and asked to come back up and deliver the same set of comments again. But yeah, so I also spent this afternoon reading that October 2024 housing study. I want to point out data from -- that was aggregated from FRED shows skyrocketing housing demand in Boone County, and data collected by the City of Columbia suggests that 37,000 more housing units are needed by 2050 to match growing housing demand. Analyses of the housing gaps in Columbia suggest that at least 208 single-family homes need to be entering the supply pool yearly. And allowing single -- and allowing short-term rentals to operate out of these single-family homes effectively remove multiple potential units from the overall housing supply, and this puts a strain on the City's housing infrastructure which inflates rents and housing costs, especially in areas like East Campus that I mentioned earlier where there's a high concentration of renters. So, yeah, that's -- that's all I have. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you so much for being here tonight. Any speaker -- or any questions for Mr. Edmondson? Oh, sorry. Commissioner Stockton, go ahead.

MS. STOCKTON: I just appreciate you and Kitty both bringing this point up. I am familiar, I run -- I work at the University teaching architectural studies and urban planning. We talk about affordable housing. I've spent a large part of my career working on these sorts of issues, and you're not

wrong. It's -- it's a complex issue. There's a lot -- lot that goes into it, and I'm working on research projects for this, but you're on the nose. And I know that if anybody doesn't know this, but Columbia is, like, on this top ten Nasdaq study list, and it's not uncommon for college towns to have this. So you are correct, and we need to be very cognizant about what we allow to be a short-term rental that could be a home for somebody that desperately needs it. So when I personally have been approving these, please know that I know that in the back of my mind, and I'm trying to strategically -- this is also my first night here. But we hear you, and I -- I deeply understand the balance of supply and demand and how we need to take this responsibility. So I just wanted to thank you both for bringing that up.

MS. EDMONDSON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Next speaker, please come forward.

MR. SPENCER: Yeah. My -- my name is Clay Spencer; I live at 1713 Richmond, as well. I'm very new to this process. I really thought if you lived in a single-family resident zone, it was kind of like set in stone and that was the law. After we bought our home and lived there for several years, I first learned that that wasn't true because a ten-person group home opened up next door to us. And then following that group home, two doors beyond that, another group home opened. So -- but in the last five years, both of those group homes have gone out of business, but on Highridge Circle, which is just a half a block to the east of us, that within the space of a city block, there are two independent living homes. And at the last meeting, the first meeting I ever came to, there was a short-term rental application for somebody right in the middle of those two independent living homes. So I don't really have an issue with a homeowner using their home for a short-term rental, but because that homeowner is -- is my neighbor, and we have shared values for property value, and for also creating a neighborhood to care about each other. But the current ordinance says that if I -- a non-home-owner -- owner wants the short-term rental, the Commission and the Council must consider the approval of neighbors, the neighboring properties. That's being eliminated by this -- changes of these proposals. And I think that's a key element because the people in the neighborhood can understand what's happening to the quality of life in that neighborhood and so I want to speak against the proposals because I think as members of the neighborhood, we should have a voice in the decision that's being made whether or not to allow a commercial interest in a residential neighborhood. Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing -- oh. Commissioner Ortiz, yes?

MS. ORTIZ: So just to -- sorry. To wrap my brain around this --

MR. SPENCER: Yes.

MS. ORTIZ: You -- there was a short-term rental in your neighborhood that came before us?

MR. SPENCER: Yes. Just --

MS. ORTIZ: And you liked having the opportunity to speak?

MR. SPENCER: Yes. And -- yes.

MS. ORTIZ: And under this new process, it would not trigger a CUP?

MR. SPENCER: That's correct.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SPENCER: Yes.

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

MR. BENTLEY: Well, again, I'm Clyde Bentley, 1863 Cliff Drive in Old East Campus. I've -- I'm much more articulate in writing than in speaking, so I hope you got my e-mail on my general notes, but I want to address some issues on affordable housing today. I really feel for you because this whole issue of the STRs, I think we've all gone to a bed and breakfast, an Airbnb, and enjoyed it, but there are very few of us want it next door to us. So you're in a quandary that I don't admire you to have to be in. What I want to look at today is -- is the idea of affordable housing. I think, arguably, the most affordable housing in Columbia is in the old central neighborhoods where your houses are small and older, and are also not protected by covenants like the newer subdivisions are. But the -- what we're looking at is the situation where the STRs for these neighborhoods can be something very wonderful, but it also can be something very bad. The bed and breakfast movement came out of England, I believe, with the idea of allowing farmers, villagers and crofters to maintain their home that they couldn't afford by renting out a few rooms here and there, getting enough income to get by, and that -- it also allowed people to express their pride in their home, two people very -- (inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sir, could you stay close to the microphone? I appreciate it.

MR. BENTLEY: Excuse me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Just stay close to the microphone, please.

MR. BENTLEY: I -- okay. But when you turned -- instead start converting neighborhoods to distributed motels, you change that situation, you raise the price of property because it becomes commercial property now. You take away the local pride in ownership and make something that is very different from -- from what you started with with the intent of protecting houses. The present ordinance makes the STR process harder for -- excuse me -- the proposed ordinance makes it harder for resident owners and easier for investor owners to go through the process. And I think that's the -- it's wrong, because what we -- if you're looking at the initial idea of a bed and breakfast, you should be supporting the resident owners. You better serve the city that way. I think one of the things that is no surprise, there haven't been a lot of applications because there was no enforcement. You've only had less than a week of -- of enforcement of this rule. And so I -- what I'm going to ask you to do is to either postpone this or reject the ordinance until you can start looking at how to protect and enforce the restrictions on multiple owners and multiple -- and dense ownership.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Bentley. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next?

MS. GARDNER: My name is Christine Gardner; I live at 112 Anderson Avenue. Before she had to leave, Pat Fowler asked me to share these papers with you, her comments, and also the earlier referenced October 24 housing study. I appreciate Clyde saying many people enjoy STRs, staying in them, but they don't want to live next to one. Well, I live next to one, so I thought I would let you know a little bit about what that's like, because it's very interesting and much more difficult than I ever thought it would be. And I knew I was not going to be happy having a short-term rental next to me, but I'm finding that First Ward where I live, we don't have driveways often, so they're parking in the street. There is a parking place in the alley, but they don't use it. They are out of compliance on the 300 foot area. I know that there is at -- probably two or more short-term rentals on Meadow Lane, which is a half block away. I've had -- it seems to be kind of a -- you know, families get together at these things, and they tend to have sometimes therapy sessions out in the backyard. And that's really not pleasant to have to listen to, and this is all within the reference of these are not my neighbors. It would be different if they were my neighbors, but when they have dogs, it's not my neighbors' dog that's barking, it's some stranger's dog. So in reference to the idea of 1,000 feet from schools that we should eliminate or may conditional use short term rentals, why would you do that when children need to live in housing close to schools? Why would you allow housing to be taken away from them? They will be empty houses instead of homes with the families in them. And I have found that they have completely distorted housing prices, because if you're making money off of a house, you can afford a pretty large mortgage. If you're a family and it is your source of home, it's -- it's an expense. It's not -- it's not an income producer. So prices have gone through the roof.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Ms. Gardner. Do you want to make a final sum up?

MS. GARDNER: Yes. I think just being able to say I want to have short-term -- I mean, I want to have long-term renters or homeowners in my neighborhood should be enough.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Gardner? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next?

MR. HASHEIDER: Good morning. My name is Jay Hasheider, and I think you all deserve a prize for being here. We all deserve a prize for being here at this ungodly hour. I am here to say that I really object to the process that has been the -- the process that's brought this ordinance in front of you tonight. The process that created the ordinance in the first place took years with a lot of feedback, a lot of workshops, a lot of public hearings. This is being crammed in a very short time frame and we're having a public hearing at this time of night. I think that just says enough right there, that we should reconsider how this process is going through. I also want to say that Mr. Zenner has pointed out that everybody is equal, but I live in a neighborhood -- I'm not sure if made my address, which is 1812 Cliff Drive. I lived in East Campus and in Benton Stephens for 45 years. I've seen the importance of long-term residency and that doesn't mean that they can't be renters, but long-term residency, that means that they're going to be there for more than a year. They feel committed to the neighborhood. Those are the

kind of neighborhoods that we need, and with that kind of structure, we can have denser neighborhoods because now everybody is in a solidarity type thing, and it's not fragmented and it's not a bad place to live. It's a place you want to live in. So long term residency is extremely important. It seemed to me that the whole process that's going on is for the ease of staff to administer the program that they had two years or better to comment on. And as in many cases, where were they commenting in those two years that they had before this first policy got -- this first ordinance got implemented? So they had a chance to do that. Let's not cram an entire rewrite to it in the matter of two months. And lastly, I want to say that I do own property in Benton-Stephens, and I have the intention of selling the property. It was a rental. I'm hoping to sell that, getting it ready for sale. I would love to have the ability to say you can have the short-term rental as part of the way that you can pay for this -- this house. It gets me some -- the maximum amount for my dollars. It also makes me feel good because I'm selling to an owner occupied house, and that part of it is being taken away because I have some -- somebody that is already a short-term renter that's only two doors down. So they would have to go through the CUP process, which is you don't have to go through if you're an investor-owned person, especially if you pick out the right spots. And so I think that there's a lot of loopholes, there's a lot of inconsistencies, and there's a lot of rationalizations that I think should be hashed out, but not at 2:30 in the morning or whatever time it is. Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. And, I'm sorry, sir. Would you stop over here and get the spelling of your name to -- are you good? Okay. Thank you.

MS. DOKKEN: Dee Dokken, First Ward. I just want to echo that I think there's a difference between a long-term resident having an STR in their home, and an investor when you look at it through a housing availability lens. I also think neighborhoods appreciate knowing -- if there's a CUP, there will be sign up saying there will be a hearing or some kind of -- it's good for people in the neighborhood to have some way to get that information that this is an STR. And I'm really glad to hear there's going to be a hotline. That will satisfy a lot of problems. And I really -- is there any other way that you can make your job easier, that would be great.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for MS Dokken? Thank you for being here, Dee. Next?

MS. HAMMEN: Hi. I'm Janet Hammen; I live at 1844 Cliff Drive. Thanks so much for staying up and not falling asleep. As already been mentioned, this -- these proposed changes are very complex, and I would suggest that the ultimate goal maybe should be to enhance the integrity of neighborhoods. Owner-occupied short-term rentals are not the same as non-resident short-term rentals for neighborhoods, and we've heard several comments on that tonight. I acknowledge you're pain, Mr. Zenner, however, the original ordinance took seven years to develop, multiple opportunity for comment, public hearings, lots of attendance at work sessions and so on. And these are major changes being made to this, and it's being frankly sprung on the public. I found out about it this week, and that's not a lot of time to digest all this. And so I -- I would ask you to allow time for discussion and for the public to



be involved. And so I would ask you to please don't approve these tonight, and put it off for a time, deny them, and have it be brought up and let people talk about it. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Hammen? Seeing none. Thanks, Janet. Next?

MR. TRABUE: Well, good morning, Commissioners. My notes say good evening, but I don't think that's appropriate anymore. My name is Tom Trabue, with Trabue Engineering, offices at 4750 North Boothe Lane. I'm representing the Columbia Board of Realtors, and would like six minutes for my presentation, if I could.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Not tonight, Tom.

MR. TRABUE: I'm going to try to be fast. The Board has been following the adoption and the implementation of the STR ordinance over the last year, and we would like to publicly compliment Pat and his staff for how helpful they have been for the STR operators in trying to navigate this process. It is a complex ordinance, and we're dealing with folks that are not used to dealing with development-type things. And so I really appreciate their help in this process. We appreciate the concerns that have been brought out by the staff, and are generally very supportive of these amendments. We feel like any effort to reduce the requirement for a conditional use permit is a positive outcome for STR operators, as well as for the Community Development Staff. We do have a couple of concerns that we would like to -- to bring forward regarding the triggers outlined in the new Tier 1 category that require conditional use permits, and how they might affect what we're trying to accomplish with this amendment. First, regarding code violations and complaints, the City gets lots of complaints, many of which are not substantive, accurate, or for that matter, compliance issues. We believe that the language in the ordinance should reflect that these should be verified complaints of non-compliance, and that they were not addressed by the owner/operator in a timely manner. We think that's really important. You're going to get lots of complaints on the hotline. I'm in favor of the hotline, but this call center is from some other place with an operator that does not know our local ordinances and is just recording random complaints that come all day, all night. Likewise, it's not uncommon for any property to be subject to a code violation. Even our inspectors do not know every code. A simple code violation of any kind should not trigger -- be a trigger for a conditional use permit. And we believe that the language can be modified slightly to reflect that these are open code violations that have not been addressed in a timely manner by the owner/operator, and I think earlier, Pat kind of addressed that a little bit, but I think the language could be a little more specific there, just to make sure that somebody doesn't get caught in that trap. Again, part of the emphasis of these amendments is to reduce the number of conditional use permits that we bring forward. The last item is with regard to the dwelling units within 1,000 feet of a school triggering the need for a conditional use permit. I did a little bit of map work as well, went at it a little bit different than the staff did, and I identified that 1,000 feet from any school property boundary is approximately 120 acres. That's a lot of area. That's a half a square mile by a half of square mile, and I think Pat kind of alluded to that in

the staff report, as well. I was really surprised when I did that exercise, because as we went through the work sessions, the 1,000 foot didn't -- it kind of triggered me a little bit, but not nearly as much when I started to put lines on the paper. We would propose that this number be reduced to 300 feet, which would equate to approximately 19 acres, or 500 feet, which would be approximately 39 acres as being a more appropriate trigger for the conditional use permit. As noted, we're generally in supportive -- supportive of these amendments to the ordinance in addressing the administrative time concerns. We think our comments are complimentary to the goal. I'll wrap up here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thanks, Tom.

MR. TRABUE: We're very respectful that the focus of these amendments is to simplify the application process and to minimize the number of CUPs required to make more effective use of the limited staff time. Thank you for the consideration of our comments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Trabue? Seeing none. Thank you so much. Next?

MR. NORGARD: Peter Norgard, 1602 Hinkson Avenue. I just want to say I've been following along this process for the last five to seven years, however long it's been. My wife and I -- Rita in the very back corner there, and, you know, we -- were -- were along for the ride because we cared a lot. We own a number -- or she owns a number of properties that we rent long-term, not short-term, and that's a conscious decision. But we want to -- I want to focus primarily on the change away from this conditional use -- the change to require a conditional use -- or not require a conditional use permit for non-resident owner/STR operators, which effectively permits anybody to participate no matter what up to 210 nights per day -- or year. The conditional use process was not established to create a constant workload for the Planning and Zoning staff and you and City Council. It was created to establish neighborhood protective standards or neighborhood protections. It's the -- in fact, it was a key neighborhood protection that we fought very hard for, and it might actually be one of the few neighborhood protections that is built into this particular ordinance. The CUP represents a soft barrier to entry, so the point here is to try and reduce the outsized impact that an STR might have on a neighborhood. And so the Commission who were not engaged in this process over five years ago probably won't remember the amount of animosity and passion that came out. And so it's with great concern that I'm sitting here speaking to you to try and convince you not to adopt these standards because it will eliminate one of the things we fought the hardest for. I would also say on the flip side of this same issue, it's being expanded to all applications -- this 1,000 foot rule, I'll just say that. It's kind of strange to me, I don't know where it comes from, I don't know what the reasoning for it is, but it does have the potential to actually increase your workload, and that's kind of pointless. But I also see it as a -- somewhat discriminatory because in these dense, inner-city neighborhoods where there's lots of schools and very small lots, there's a much greater chance that if you want to apply for an STR, you're going to trigger the threshold. The further out into the city limits you get, the larger the lots are, and the more distributed the schools are, and so people out there are less likely

to trigger these -- this 1,000 foot rule. And so in that sense, I think it creates a little bit of an unfair bias for those folks. And I'm going to skip a bunch here because people have already said it. The change in definition for an owner/operator and a single-family operator is concerning because it creates this accessibility standard that applies to everybody, so a person in their home who wants to rent out a bedroom now might have to participate in ADA standards that they had no idea. And the wording is pretty vague, and I think that it demands a little bit more clarity before you would accept it.

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

MR. NORGARD: So I would ask you to reject this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Norgard? Seeing none. Thank you for being here. Anyone else to speak? Now is your chance. If you don't stand up, I'm going to close public comment. Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comment on the text changes? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I've ingested everyone's statements, and you're right. This is probably not the best time to make these comments, but we're here till 2:00. We're here to -- or 1:00, excuse me. We're almost here to 1:00. Staff has been here long -- just as long. And I'm about the efficiency of getting -- if you're following me through this whole process, you know I was big on calling people renegades and not complying, and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Right? We have to get people under the law, and it's very easy to say, well, tough stuff, that's your job, that's your blah, blah, blah. We don't get paid up here. I pour concrete -- commercial concrete for a living. I've been up since 4:00. I've been doing physical construction since 4:00 this morning and came directly to this meeting, after taking a bath, so I wouldn't offend my Commissioners. It is 1:00. I haven't been typing in front of a computer or reading books. I have been physically laboring all day to come here and be here all night. And as you've heard Mr. Zenner say, the next meeting is going to be pretty similar to this meeting, and the meeting after that is going to be pretty similar to that meeting, and that's going to go on and on and on. If this is not a -- if we don't like this process, please suggest a way to make this easier, at least for the paid staff and especially the people that don't get paid. This is going to take a lot of time. I'm all about the transparency. I'm all about all of that, until you've been through a couple of these meeting. I have a pour tomorrow at 4:00, I've got to be up to start ready for work. It is 1:00 now. And I have four to five months of this to do. So please help us find an efficient way, staff wise, to digest 400 applications, or they will continue to operate underground and not be regulated, and cause more harm to our neighborhood because there's no way to know they exist, they live underground, they're working outside the boundaries of the law that we spent seven years trying to craft. So this is not perfect, but just like the ordinance wasn't perfect that we put on the table, I am saying let's throw this out, let's work this, and fine tune. I think the best laws are those that get put out and are easy to pivot. We can put this right back on the table and look at it again. One more statement. The distances that we have determined have been fought for for months. My position,

and I can only claim for my position, the 1,000 feet from the schools is consistent with -- imagine, like, sexual predators or people that had to be registered sex offenders. I'm not going to trust an Airbnb person to make sure that that's done. I'm not. So I'm going to guarantee about making 1,000-foot radius around schools, and I'm going to make that a determination and how I determine what Airbnbs or short-term rentals exist around schools. So I'm not in support of shrinking that at all, because I don't support, I don't have the trust in a business entity to make sure that there's not any sexual predators in that area. Just my opinion. Just my opinion on that subject. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Who would like to speak next? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I appreciate -- I appreciate everybody who comes to share and who has concerns and who gives perspective because it helps inform the decisions that we have to make. I arrived on the Commission as the Commission was coming to a close about all of the work that had been done for this process. And I distinctly remember having a conversation about how much time should we give so that people get used to, hey, this is coming. We're not going to implement this right away. We're going to give a year, and let people know, hey, this is coming. You've got to get it together. You've got to, you know, come in and get your application in. And I heard some individuals say, well, I just learned about this. And for my fellow attorneys, we all know ignorance of the law is no excuse, so you may not have known, and yet the law still is -- it's still enforced. And there has to be a line in the sand. There has to be a starting point. It has to happen. Is it ideal? Probably not. Is it necessary? Absolutely. I just did rough math very quickly because I'm a person about evidence, I'm not about emotion. I'm about evidence. So if we say we believe there are 450 short-term rentals in Columbia and there are about 35,000, 36,000 single-family homes, that's one percent. So I get that it feels painful when it's your neighborhood, but, overall, the arguments that we're making saying that these short-term rentals are influencing the prices of Columbia, that's not realistic. It doesn't make sense that one percent is influencing something to 300 percent of what it was four or five years ago. That's not what's happening. There's something else happening and we should probably actually investigate that so that we can make a difference. Home ownership and housing is extremely important to me and everybody on this Commission knows because I've said it from the beginning. I've been homeless three times in my life, and so it is extremely important to me, and I value when people come and say, hey, I bought a home and I didn't expect that this was going to, you know, show up next to me. I get it. And also, it is important for us to protect the rights of individuals to do with their home what is available for them to do. And I -- as I've said many times, I protect that right for everyone. So if you decide tomorrow, you know, you've got a medical tragedy in your family, you need some money, you've got to go ahead and rent your house out, and you decide this is what I need to do, I'm here for protecting that right for you, just like I'm here for protecting it for the person that we may be upset with today. In many of these cases, in most of the cases, these short-term rentals -- we found out one tonight, it's been going for seven years. Right? And many of these cases, they have been in operation under your nose. You didn't even know. Right?

And then you get a notification and it's, like, gosh, darn it, this is crazy. Why is this happening? And it's been happening for seven years. So as I've said from the beginning, let's let the law work. I am supportive of these changes mainly because I'm -- I'm not a nighttime person, so for me, I am suffering right now in ways that I cannot comprehend or explain to you. I am a morning person, and like my co-Commissioner, I get up at 4:00 a.m. regardless, so I will be up at 4:00 a.m., even if I go to sleep at 3:39, I will be up at 4:00 because that's just my life. And I get dings of e-mails at 12:00. This weekend, it came on Saturday or something from Pat, and I've got to be honest with you when I tell you that's not fair. It's not fair that he -- this is not what he signed up for. It is not. He has, you know, a role and a job to perform, and this is not what he signed up for, to have to stay up late at night, work on weekends, spend four hours to eight hours working on something that we're going to vote similarly on every single time. Are we -- I'm not here to eliminate your voice. I'm here to tell you that your voice can still be heard when you complain about somebody has got too many cars parked out front. Okay. Your voice is still heard. You need to tell us that. You need to explain there's stuff going on over there and perhaps we should investigate that. And once you allow the law to work, that person's license will be revoked, and you can shut it down. But let's let the law work before we say it doesn't work. Okay. Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. I'm going to keep it really short, because I -- obviously, it's 1:00 a.m., but also I have a lot of thoughts on that, and I'm pretty torn. But I think what I'm coming down to is that I think that City leadership needs to solve this problem and it's not the resident's responsibility to come up with the solutions. And I also think that it's not the job of this Commission to sacrifice community members and, like, their input just for efficiency of staff time. I'm going to leave it there.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next? Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: I plan to support this because -- I am sympathetic to all the speakers I heard. I mean, there's a lot of valid points that I haven't thought about, and part of it is that I'm new to this commission and there has been a ton of time put into this. I can tell just from sitting here and, you know, listening to what I have heard, and all the paperwork and the staff report, it seems like there needs to be something. So maybe this isn't the perfect solution, but this -- as Commissioner Stanton said, this is a step in the right direction, I think, so I plan to support it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: So generally, I'm supportive of making some changes to get us away from all these conditional use permit approval processes. I'm not supportive of the changes as they are written currently. I have two main issues: One is the 1,000 feet from a school. So we're saying, if you're within 1,000 feet of a school, we're going to kick you into this conditional use process, but the fact that you're near a school, isn't one of the five things that we even evaluate the conditional use permit process for.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Also part of the amendment.

MR. BRODSKY: I don't think we added anything to it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. BRODSKY: The other issue I have is that, you know, we have -- we have five things that we use to evaluate the conditional use -- just that it's near one. We have five things that we -- that we are -- currently evaluate conditional use permit on. Owner-occupancy, I don't -- I'm not sure we've had one of those. Proximity to an existing STR, I think tonight is the first time we've -- we've denied one based off that. Applicant's STR history, we definitely consider that quite a bit. Impact on properties, whether the STR is going to increase the intensity of property use, I don't think we've ever considered that. And then Neighborhood Support. We have denied -- or recommended denial of a conditional use permit many times, based off the lack of neighborhood support, and we are getting rid of -- you know, they could have 100 percent of their neighbors around them couldn't be in opposition, and they're going to go through an administrative process because they don't have one within 300 feet. So those are my two main issues.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Go ahead, Commissioner Gray.

MS. GRAY: Yeah. I am very empathetic to some of the concerns that have been brought forward. My relationship to this ordinance is quite new, even though I've been following these meetings for a while. I do have some concerns about the treating things equally, just as Kimberly Crenshaw quote. Sometimes treating different things the same is less equitable, so a little bit of suspicion there, but I'm also equally suspicious of the fear of strangers and what the difference is between a stranger and a neighbor in terms of investment, in terms of imagining a future of living right alongside someone. I say that as a person who lives directly across from two Airbnbs which started this villain origin story for me here. I -- I am curious about what denying or deferring this would entail in terms of the after-effects, looking at -- because, again, new to this, did a lot of my own research and read staff reports. Thank you for that labor. That complex and, like, convoluted ordinances are a massive problem in getting people to -- if you don't have -- if you convoluted ordinances with little enforcement, which, up until this point, we have not because June 1st, less than 10 percent of people are going to apply. So I see this amendment as necessary in the fact that it could create additional labor in terms of incoming applications, but the opportunity to have oversight over folks who may be doing not great things right now seems important.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead, Commissioner Stanton. I'm sorry. Were you finished, Commissioner Gray?

MS. GRAY: I was.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: To my fellow Commissioners, I look at this from -- the staffing is becoming more and more of an issue to me, especially -- I mean, personally. I am 51 years old, and there is such a shortage of people doing what I do that a 51-year-old with an average finishing crew of about 45, the people -- the professionals I work around, are pouring commercial concrete. We have a young staff of

planners over there that we're getting to crash out, and excuse my Ebonics, but crashing out means you're getting ready to overwork them and overburden them to where they're not going to be able to focus on things that are probably more important. I'm not saying this is not important. I, personally, have spent seven years on this topic myself. Seven, myself. We're going to crash out this staff and there's a lot bigger things coming down the road as far as us as a municipality. And if I'm going to crash the staff out, let's crash it on something else, and not on this situation right here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So when we started the last round of this, when we said let's start over from scratch, and -- and build something from the ground up that is custom tailored to Columbia, that is not just take somebody else's ordinance and put it here. We developed a set of guiding principles, and I just want to remind everyone of what those were briefly. I'm not going to read to you all. But basically, encourage homeownership, encourage different types of housing stock, encourage easy use of STRs for the original model, which is, you know, the green book, and essentially, it's people renting out space in their own homes, and allow homeowners to benefit from extra income in their property while balancing that against their neighbors, which also includes not just homeowners, but also tenants, because that was also very important to us, an equitable relationship or treatment of people who need that extra income in order to be able to stay in their homes. To me, these changes do nothing to impact any of those. What these changes do is make it easier if you are a homeowner who wants to rent out your mother-in-law apartment, or a room in your house, now you're not limited to 30 days. You get up to 120 days without having to add any extra parking, you get up to 210 days without having to do anything else if you've got adequate parking. It does nothing to prevent those original Tier 1 30-day administrative approval folks from not only going through that same process they would have had to otherwise, but getting more days with still not having to come before us. This makes it easier on those original model folks, not harder. This does nothing to make them come and get a CUP unless they're in a sensitive area where we are concerned about neighborhood impacts because of a lack of parking, which will impact your neighborhood, because of complaints against them, which means you're an impact on your neighborhood, because of being within a school, which means you're an impact on the neighborhood. Because we do want to prioritize kids being able to live close to a school and areas around schools being more sensitive to, you know, guest turnover. All of these things are not only things that will have an impact on your neighborhood, but are also reasons that we have denied things or discussed denying or, you know, had tied votes on -- on STRs. When we developed these amendments with staff, staff developed them, but staff did those triggers based on what we were denying, based on what our concerns were, not pulling them out of the air. And I appreciate the fact that we've had a year where we've seen case after case after case, and generally approved them unless there's massive neighborhood opposition including filing regular complaints with the City, unless they are literally right next door to another STR, unless they are a owner who never even showed up, and who also had a bunch of complaints against them. So I understand that there is some concern that now you're not going

to hear about every single STR application. I also think it's not going to make a difference on which ones would have been approved, because the ones that would have been denied are still going to be here in front of us. The neighbors are still going to be able to show up and say I've called five times on that guy, he never mows his lawn. We're not touching the fact that each person gets one, which means we're not increasing the total number across the city. We aren't changing the fact that if you are close to one, you know, if you've got density in a particular neighborhood, they're going to be here, and we can deny them, because density in the First Ward is a serious concern. They're all going to have to be here. They are not getting approved with -- with administrative approval, and we're not changing the fact that if you are a long-term tenant or a homeowner who wants to make a little bit of extra income so you can stay in your home, you could do that. In fact, you can do that easier and more efficiently and -- not efficiently, and make more money so that you can do that, because you're not limited to 30 days anymore. So I -- I just want everyone listening and City Council eventually when they read this, to know that we have not abandoned those principles. Those principles are still what we are following. I truly believe that these changes will allow those principles to stand without continuing to put us here at 1:15, 1:20, 1:30, 2:00 a.m. week after -- or month after month, week after week, with all of you all having to come out time and time again. I -- I truly believe that this is a step in the right direction, and I also trust the people in this room, most of whom I know and have worked with on other community projects or have seen here time and time again, you're keeping an eye on things. And while it's not your job to come up with solutions, it is your job as community activists and leaders to tell us when problems exist. So if we get down this road in another six months, and you come to us and say, hey, for whatever reason, administrative staff is really messing this up and we have a whole street of them over here in the First Ward, tell us. If there's an STR that is having party after party after party, tell us. We can amend this again if this doesn't work. But I can tell you right now, what we've been doing for the last year has been an interesting exercise, but not a great use of our time because 95 percent have been approved. And that is weeks of not just staff time, but Commission time, at an average of 45 minutes per case with almost all of them getting approved. So I -- I'm going to stop pontificating, but when I look at this, the core issue is how many are there going to be across the city. We haven't changed that. Are we going to do something about density in particular neighborhoods. We haven't changed that. And if someone is a bad neighbor and a problem, can we stop them from operating an STR. We haven't changed that, so I'm -- I'm in favor of these changes. Anybody else? Seeing none. Would anyone like to make a motion?

MS. STOCKTON: I was just going to say that we might need to have a short-term rental for this room here pretty soon. I don't know how that process works

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think you have to stay 24 hours before that, which -- so Pat?

MR. ZENNER: I'm close, but, you know.

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

MS. WILSON: Sure. I'll do it.



MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: In the matter of Case Number 110-2024 --

MR. ZENNER: That's the wrong case number. Forgot to change that slide. It's 215-2025.

MS. WILSON: Oh, okay. Let's start over. In the matter of Case Number -- you tried to trick me -- 215-2025, is -- that is -- why is that up there?

MS. ORTIZ: I think the heading wasn't changed.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. The heading -- the heading. I apologize. The heading didn't get changed.

MS. WILSON: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you just read the recommendation sentence; will that work?

MS. WILSON: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: She doesn't have to read all the sections, or does she?

MS. WILSON: I will get -- I will get to it. I will get to that. Oh, okay. Okay. Thank you.

MR. CRAIG: Just the recommendation will be fine.

MS. WILSON: Yeah. Is that correct? Okay. Let's try it again. In the matter of Case Number 202-2025.

MS. GEUEA JONES: 215-2025.

MS. WILSON: Maybe I'm not the one. I'm tired. I'm going to try it one more time. Give me one more chance.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You can do it, Shannon.

MS. WILSON: All right. In the matter of Case Number 215-2025, a request by the City of Columbia to amend Sections 29-1.11(a)[Definitions], 29-3.2, Table 29-3.1 [Permitted Use Table] -- uh-huh, all of the things. In the matter of all of those -- those things, I recommend approval of the proposed revisions to the regulations pertaining to STRs.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Wilson, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there further discussion on the motion? Ms. Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I just want to say I respect everyone on -- on our -- here and out there, but I am not going to support this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further discussion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Stockton, Dr. Gray. Voting No: Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Walters. Motion carries 6-3.**

MR. BRODSKY: Motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. By your vote of 7 to 2 --

MR. ZENNER: Six to three.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Six to three. I'm sorry.

MR. ZENNER: Six to three.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Missed that one. Sorry. Six to three, that recommendation for approval will be sent to City Council. No further cases coming before us.

#### **VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any public comments of a general nature? Seeing none.

#### **IX. STAFF COMMENTS**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: So your next meeting, you get to go take a break, will be January -- or July 10. I would love January 10 -- July 10 will be your next meeting due to the holiday. And unfortunately, as I indicated in work session today, the July 10 agenda, given that it is a compilation of not only our May 12th applications, it is also inclusive of the June 2nd applications. It is a two-page upcoming list. We have three subdivision requests, two final plats that are not previously platted property. One of these final plats off of Meadow Lane, the 105 Meadow Lane final may not make it to the agenda. There are some significant elements and a required design adjustment that has not yet been advertised, to my knowledge, and it may not make the deadline for advertising, so it may not make the agenda. But we do have a follow-up platting action on a recent permanent zoning and annexation down on East Old Plank. This is the Bethel Church property at East Bethel and -- I can't remember the cross street. It's late. But we've got one on Clark Lane, a preliminary plat on Clark, so those are our standard preliminary final platting actions. And in -- our volume on regular and real interesting rezoning requests are starting to pick up, so this section of the agenda, which has been light, is going to potentially increase in its level of complexity. We have the following five cases as it relates to public hearings. We have a property that is presently a PD at 1805 McKee Street. It is going to revise the PD Plan, and basically a new statement of intent. Given the nature of this property, planned district zoning is something that we do believe is appropriate given its location and its environmentally impacted portions. We have a permanent zoning request off of I-70 Drive Southeast. This is just on the south side of I-70 south of where ABC Land -- no, ABC Lane and Eurofins is located, so it's on the opposite side of the interstate. We have a multiple parcel rezoning request off of Commerce Court, which is, again, that is on the north side of the interstate between Vandiver and Providence. And if any of you are familiar with where Beyond Meat used to be or was. That is a request that is taking a request to go from M-C to I-G, more in an industrial environment. There's about 11 parcels involved in that request. St. Charles Road, another rezoning request, PD to M-C. We have an interesting rezoning and PD plan approval for the west half or the western portion of Tract 5 of the Richland Road annexation, which is immediately north of the Brooke Subdivision. A series of streets in the Brooke Subdivision which is across from El Chaparral off of Route WW. Streets come off of that and the parcel to the east of it is a portion of Brooke, as well, that accesses Rolling Hills, but

there is no direct connection, so this is going to be a somewhat isolated piece. It is presently zoned planned district. The request is actually to revise that statement of intent and approve a PD plan. Again, this is not one of those that we believe we need to take out of planned district just due to some of the issues. And then the short-term rentals get their whole page. So you will notice that there is a series of adjacent addresses along Pfeiffer (ph.). You will hopefully compliment me at a later date. I attempted to talk the applicant off the ledge, and the applicant did not heed my advice. And this is going to be -- this is one building in four separate ownerships. It's a condo 'ed building. Each member of the family has a unit. Legally permissible by the code. We've informed him when he made his application that the likelihood of getting all but one potentially approved was going to be maybe a challenge. So those are all being handled by Mr. Halligan. The details won't be a whole lot different because they're all the same size, so it's wash, repeat and wash, rinse, and repeat for each of the cases. Then we have three unique ones, one off of North Greenwood. This is a single garage over almost like an ADU situation, R-2 zoned, Maplegrove Way. This is just south of Southampton and then 317 Victoria Drive. So you can put your eyes on where we're located, and then that is all we have to offer. Thank you very much for your attention tonight, and we will, as discussed during work session, begin to do some public outreach as it relates to the definition of family and those revisions we talked about in work session.

**X. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

There were no commissioner comments.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton, did I hear you had a motion.

MR. STANTON: Yes, Madam Chair, if Mr. Zenner is finished.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. He's finished.

MR. ZENNER: Actually, I apologize. As the public may be aware or the public may not be aware, I would like recognize the fact that this evening is Mr. Tim Teddy, our Community Development Director's last meeting with the City of Columbia.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, that's right. You almost got away.

MR. ZENNER: And I am not normally one to make soft speeches, but I will tell you after 16 years of working with Tim, it has been the utmost honor to work with an individual with the integrity and the skill set that Tim has exhibited in my career here. Tim grew up not far from where I did in Illinois. And when we first met which I interviewed for this job, I never remember -- I'll never forget him taking me out, touring me around town, and coming back and asking me, well, what do you think? At that point, I was an unemployed former land development director of a national home builder, and I was thinking, well, this is a perfect gig. Somebody that grew up down the road for in a different community, but we have a lot to share in common. I never realized over the course of the time that I have had had an opportunity to work with him what I would learn and what I would see Tim learn. Tim went really from managing a department that didn't have protective -- and what was protected inspections, BSD, and when BSD was

merged into the Community Development Department, along with our Neighborhood Services staff in roughly 2010, Tim excelled in being able to understand the complexities of what we have. He has been an asset to our organization. He's been an asset as a leader to this department, and he has allowed all of us as staff that have worked underneath him to grow and understand how to do our job better, but knowing we had him to rely on when we needed that assistance. It is going to be difficult beginning in July when Tim is not here to be able to walk down to his office and vent, as I have been able to do over the course of the last five or so years, more frequently and a little bit more vocally, but always sat there and he's listened and he's been, you know, in that fatherly way, it's going to be okay, look at it from this perspective. We will miss him greatly. And while I have managed this organization and this part of our operation, Tim has always been behind me to be the supporter and a cheerleader for me to do what I've been doing. And for that, I will be ultimately grateful. Never have I stayed in an organization as long as I have here in Columbia, and a lot of that has to deal with the leadership that I have had the opportunity to work with. With that, I greatly appreciate his service, and I wish him the best as retirement brings him and Chris, his wife, an opportunity to do what they like. He does not have to attend a Monday night meeting, and then come in and be here until 1:00 a.m. or 3:00 a.m. in the morning to deal with planning. So thank you very much, Tim, for your service. Thank you very much for allowing it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can we bribe you to show up at one of our July meetings so we can say nice things about you?

MR. TEDDY: Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Excellent. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: If my Commission has had nothing else to say and staff is completed with their words, I move to adjourn, Madam Chair.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Without objection, we stand adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 1:31 a.m.)

(Off the record.)